

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL RECTORY, HAVANT,
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XV

JULY, 1927

No. 85

EDITORIAL

THE REAL ISSUE

THE Assembly will meet this month to discuss, and probably to pass, the most important Measure which has so far occupied its attention. There has been a steady settling of opinion in the Church, registered in a succession of Diocesan Conferences, in favour of accepting the new Prayer Book, and this on many grounds. Chief of these has been its merits as a real enrichment of public worship and the increased facilities which it gives to the clergy in the discharge of their pastoral duties. Another has been the desire, felt in all quarters of the Church and not least among Anglo-Catholics, to secure authority for variations from the old order which experience and scholarship alike had shown to be overdue; and the prospect of recovering a discipline which should be based on concord has been felt to outweigh criticisms of detail, even of important detail. Yet a third and obviously potent cause has been the instinct of loyalty to the leadership of the bishops, which, while dispensing no-one from the duty of exercising his judgment nor foreclosing any efforts at further revision in the future, is a necessary corollary of episcopal government. We publish today from the pen of Mr. Alan Leslie, Chancellor of the Diocese of Lichfield, an article on some of the legal aspects of the new Book, which we can whole-heartedly endorse.

The new Book will come before the Assembly as the Schedule to a Measure; and it is reasonable to suppose that it is the Measure and the policy embodied in it which will receive the greater attention. We believe that the Measure is in its ultimate issues concerned more with liberty than with law; but we desire first to draw attention to one serious exception to this principle, which seems to us to represent a retrograde and

reactionary policy; and we hope that it will be amended. We refer to Clause 5, which deals with copyright in the new Book. The effect of this Clause is not only to tie up the copyright in the new Book (which contains the old) far more rigorously than has been the case hitherto; but by giving the Central Board of Finance a hand in the pie, a new and dangerous principle is introduced into the Church's devotional liberty. It is in effect to give the Central Board of Finance a controlling voice in the publication of any devotional books which contain parts of the Prayer Book. The principle is thoroughly Erastian, and we hope that the Clause will not be enacted.

This Clause apart, however, we maintain that the real issue with which the Measure is concerned is one of liberty rather than of law—of law, indeed, as an instrument to liberty. Needless to say, the liberty we have in mind is not the liberty of the individual to depart from the Book; it is the liberty, now for the first time claimed by the Church of England as a whole, to order its own worship. Clause 4, which defines the *ius liturgicum* of the bishops, will prove, we believe, to be the charter of a great emancipation. It is pregnant with the logic of reform in the political relations of the Church. For it cannot be supposed that a living spiritual authority of this kind, aptly embodying the spiritual autonomy of the Church, can co-exist for long with a method of appointing bishops which is so much at variance with it. The hawsers which bind the ship of the Church to its old-established berth are straining and creaking, as the ship's sails are hoisted upward and catch the breezes of heaven. The time has come to release the ropes. Almost half of the dioceses of England today have been endowed out of voluntary contributions during the last two or three generations; and the patronage surrendered to the State. That fact constitutes an overwhelming claim when it comes to varying the terms of our partnership. On neither side, probably, is its complete dissolution desired; but the present system is an obsolete anomaly, and needs radical reform. Let the Church be united now, and it will win its freedom.

THE YEAR 1927 AND REUNION PROBLEMS

THIS is a critical year for many departments of religion, and certainly not least so for the prospects of Reunion in Christendom. In the first place, it is the year of the assembly of the World Conference on Faith and Order. Secondly, the Anglican Communion is faced with a domestic problem of the first importance in the projected scheme of reunion in South India. Thirdly, we have an entirely fresh organization working for corporate reunion in the persons of the new religious Order, the Monks of Union, recently inaugurated by the Pope.

It is sufficiently obvious that the three facts are not *in pari materia*. The World Conference is essentially a *discussion*. It is not likely to have any immediate, tangible result. Its aim is to discover how far the Christian communities of the world are already at one, and what exactly are the differences which will have to be composed before they can re-enter communion with each other. Its importance is likely to lie principally in the stimulation of desire for unity and in the promotion of mutual understanding. The very vastness of the scale on which it is conceived implies a distant rather than an immediate outlook. The South Indian crisis, on the other hand, is a matter of urgency. In itself a local matter, affecting comparatively small numbers, it none the less seems to touch vital principles, and in any case must be settled one way or the other, and settled quickly. And it is impossible to say how much might depend on the nature of the settlement. The third factor in the situation, far less conspicuous than either of the others, may well turn out to be the most powerful of all. The Monks of Union are a very small congregation. They neither strive nor cry. "Ni prosélytisme, ni bienfaisance" (bribery), "ni conception impérialiste" is their motto. But it may come about that as a focus for the prayer of the Roman Catholic Church and of its will for unity this little society may accomplish very great things indeed.

But, of course, these three factors in the 1927 situation are not entirely new and independent phenomena. Rather they are vortices by which the various currents which flow towards reunion are manifesting their force and their rapidity. We can only judge their character in view of the wider tendencies of the currents themselves. First, then, we have to ask the plain question: Are there any signs that Christendom is moving towards a general reunion? To that question there can only be one possible answer, and that is No. There are absolutely no indications at present that it will ever be possible to comprehend the extreme wings of the Christian army in one organic body

for the simple reason that their fundamental beliefs are obviously contradictory. And with all our aspirations after unity there is no sign whatever that either of the two wings is changing the general character of its beliefs. What has changed so marvellously is the temper in which they hold them! And owing to this change of temper Christians are asking on all sides why they need be separated from other Christians whose beliefs are after all, perhaps, not so incompatible with their own as they once seemed. It would be deceiving ourselves to imagine that this implies a tendency to general reunion; what it does seem to imply is a *tendency* towards coalescence into (ultimately) two or three groups. One might possibly (with the necessary apologies) go into further detail, and say that there are signs that the ultimate tendency, so far as it can be detected at present, is towards a division of Christians into an evangelical Catholicism on the one hand, and a somewhat rationalistic Protestantism on the other. Christians everywhere are seeking out affinities, and under the influence of these affinities are themselves undergoing astonishing changes. We find Roman Catholics saying: "How much we have to learn from the East!" Lutherans extolling Anglo-Catholicism, Congregationalists adopting Latin forms of devotion, Anglicans borrowing from the Society of Friends. The whole process is going on at an extraordinary pace, and it is not surprising that men are asking everywhere why they need wait any longer, and whether the time is not ripe for re-uniting some at least of the severed parts of Christendom. They may be right; only it is important that they should see clearly what they are doing, and they should not imagine that they are bringing back the Great Church, when, in fact, they are at present assisting only in a regrouping of Christians. Probably some such regrouping will be necessary long before the day of final reunion, and no doubt when the time for it has come the way will be made plain. But it is a fatal thing to push through hastily conceived schemes without realizing when the healing of one schism is only likely to produce another.* The very fact that we are moving so quickly makes it possible that we shall soon be far more ready for fusion than we are today. We must be patient.

One of the most notable factors in the present comparative fluidity of Christendom is the dying out of the old-fashioned complacent Anglicanism. The Church of England is still rightly proud of the great principles which it seems to be her vocation to defend, but fortunately she has almost entirely ceased to be proud of the way in which she actually embodies

* This is what has actually happened in the case of the "United Church" in Canada, where the "Continuing Presbyterians" remain outside the Union.

them. It would not be fair to except from this statement even the sorely tried "official element." The Anglican Bishops are probably the last people who have any reason to rely placidly on traditional Anglicanism. They have their hands full with the difficult and necessary task of directing a river which is changing its course. One of their first preoccupations is no doubt to prevent the premature formation of a delta.

For the rest, the most devoted and energetic members of the Anglican Church seem to fall into various strong and eager minorities who have this in common, that they feel very keenly the attraction of non-Anglican influences and ideals.

There is a group which is frankly attracted to Rome as the moon is to the sun, a simile which will perhaps bear working out a little. There is another group whose position is more difficult to describe. It combines emulation of the devotional and ascetic standards of the Roman Church with a great appreciation of the comparative liberty of thought and practice which is tolerated in the Anglican Communion. While passionately tenacious of the name of Catholic, it claims to be at the same time modern, liberal, realist, and Western. Thirdly, there is a group which is far more critical of Roman standards both devotional and doctrinal. Equally appreciative of the Catholic ideal, it finds itself on the whole more repelled than attracted by the Roman exhibition of it. It tends to be medieval in ceremonial, Oriental in sympathy, and on the whole rather conservative in theology, but less so than the first group. These three groups make up the Anglo-Catholic party, and work together for the most part in harmony and mutual appreciation.

Moving towards the Left we next come to a group, the newer Evangelicals, whose attraction is the English-speaking Christian world. Their own theology being for the most part on the conservative side, their wish none the less would be to sink differences, and to pool the spiritual resources of the Empire.

Finally, there is a small intellectualist group of advanced Liberals, who tend to sit very loose to all that is dogmatic and ecclesiastical, and whose affinities are with the Protestantism of Northern Europe.

Of course, all this is a very rough and crude simplification of a very complicated state of affairs, but enough has been said to suggest that if the proverbial inhabitant of Mars were to hold a Visitation of the Church, he would very likely decide that we were only held together by the accident of Establishment, and that the right and natural thing would be to let so incompact a body disintegrate. But nevertheless our distinguished visitor would be wrong. National feeling has a good deal to do with the preservation of the Anglican Church, but establishment

has very little. There is, in fact, less tendency to talk about disruption in the parts of our Communion which are not established than in the English Church itself, which is probably to be accounted for by the fact that England is the only country which has retained the monstrous and detestable anomaly of the appointment of bishops by politicians. The Anglican Church does not wish for disruption. Most of us might be able to make up a private "little list" of those who we think, to our great personal regret, ought logically to part with us; but none of us really wish to secede ourselves. Anglo-Catholics do not wish to be attracted into the Roman Church. They have too much regard for their liberties. Evangelicals do not desire union with Nonconformists *instead of* their present allegiance. They set too much value on history. It is true that religious opinion, inside and outside of the Church of England, is in rapid movement, but at the moment neither the ravens nor the doves who survey the face of the surrounding water can find rest for their feet elsewhere than in their ancestral ark.

But, as we have said, it is not only within the Anglican Church that things are moving.

In the Roman Church the whole position has been transformed. A new character has been given to the desire for unity under the personal influence of a remarkable Pope, cultured, virile, travelled, learned, charitable, sympathetic: "a Pope to be thankful for," says the Bishop in Corea.* The cause of unity has suffered grievously in the death of the great Cardinal Mercier and the Abbé Portal; but their works follow them, and we can never again think of the Roman Church as a proud corporation which desires nothing but the enslavement of the world. The new policy of the Vatican towards reunion might almost be described as a new heart.

This policy has taken a tangible form in the foundation of the Monks of Union, a congregation whose object is officially stated in the following form: "To consecrate themselves completely . . . to the apostolate of the union of the Churches and to prepare by slow, pacific, and fraternal action for the return of the separated Christendoms to the ecumenical unity of the Church." The principal objective of the new movement is, no doubt, a reunion between the Roman and Orthodox Churches, and the spirit in which Dom Beauduin, the Superior of the Order, approaches the problem leaves nothing to be desired. "Let us Latins preserve the traditions of the Holy Roman Church, but let us recognize the same right in all our separated brethren." While on the one hand there must be no minimizing,

* *The East and the West*, January, 1927.

seeing that "doctrinal concessions, convenient reticences, equivocal formulæ, are worse than division," there must, on the other hand, be no attempt to impose on others the scholastic philosophy or the Latin system of thought. If the Easterns prefer to found their faith on the Bible, the Councils and the Fathers, they have a perfect right to do so. Individual conversions are not to be attempted except in cases where the conscience of the separated brother is already disquieted.

Nor is the spirit of his approach to the English Church less admirable. While presupposing, as he is bound to do, that the "Catholic Church" in England is that body over which Cardinal Bourne presides, he is very far indeed from holding that the only hope of unity is a stream of individual conversions. There is, he believes, a more excellent way. "Our wish is that in attaching itself to us in dogmatic unity, a part at least of the Anglican Church should bring to us by its uninterrupted continuity the most desirable riches of that life which is its own special possession." "A Church of England absorbed by Rome and a Church of England separate from Rome are two conceptions equally inadmissible. Could one not seek a formula in the middle, the only historical, way: a Church of England filially united with Rome?" "Let us not seek for an exterior victory, a cold and formal hierarchic domination; let us not work for a union on paper or in statistics, but for a union in Christ."

But while it is right to dream of unity with the Holy See, our relations with the Orthodox Churches of the East grow daily closer and more intimate. Here we have actual tangible facts of intercommunion to encourage us to expect the day when there will be nothing to separate us except the permanent and necessary differences of rite and of mentality. Only once more it is necessary to say that reunion cannot be hurried. The hierarchy of the "unchanging East" has moved towards us far more quickly than could have been expected. Not only has the validity of Anglican Orders been recognized by Constantinople as completely as the principles of the Orthodox could permit, but permanent arrangements have been adopted in America, in Serbia, in South Africa, and other places, whereby the Sacraments can be mutually received by Anglicans and Orthodox: the Archbishop of Canterbury has acted ministerially at a Liturgy celebrated by an Oriental Patriarch; and important and conservative Eastern prelates have made remarkable pronouncements. They have said that dogmatic reunion is probably possible with the Anglican Communion as a whole, and that it will not be long delayed; that Anglican Bishops are Bishops of the Church: that Anglican clergy desiring to unite themselves to the Orthodox Church would not have to be

ordained. Nor can we lightly forget that feast of St. Peter of 1925 when Patriarchs and Bishops of the Eastern Churches took their part in our great liturgical commemoration of the Council of Nicæa.

The importance of all this is very great, not only in itself, but in the interest of a yet wider reunion. A really reunited Church, with centres in Constantinople and Canterbury, would challenge comparison with Rome itself as a world-wide institution, and would have an unconscious effect in getting rid of the idea that reunion with Rome must necessarily mean surrender without explanations or conditions, and subsequent absorption. So, too, it is possible—the suggestion is Dom Beauduin's—that reunion with the “Romano-Germanic culture of England, and its Western religious mentality and traditions,” might ease for the Orthodox the approach to reconciliation with the Papacy.

Moreover, the tribulations of our brethren of the East cannot fail to play their part in changing the relations between them and their fellow-Christians of the West. Not only does their heroism move us all to admiration and their suffering to sympathy, but the very fact that so many of their noblest and most cultured sons are scattered abroad throughout the West means inevitably that we are getting to know and understand each other better. Not only Easterns and Anglicans, but also Easterns and Romans, have learned to fraternize. And the Easterns in question have been largely *Slavs*, who for centuries have been far more firmly opposed to everything Roman and Western than the Greeks.

In view of all these facts, it is difficult to see how anyone can fail to approve and support the coming Conference on Faith and Order. It springs out of the faith and enterprise of a branch of the Anglican Communion in which Catholic principles are well known and recognized. It has the active support of the Orthodox, and the sympathetic recognition of the Holy See. It will give Catholics an opportunity of making known their aspirations and their difficulties. No statement will be adopted unless it has been accepted *nemine contradicente*. And, at the worst, it binds no one!

The South India proposals, on the other hand, present a serious danger. The original proposal to get over the difficulty of the re-ordination of the ministers of the South India United Church by an Ordination which was officially declared not to be an Ordination, has fortunately been abandoned. The present suggestion is simply to accept these ministers as though they were in episcopal Orders. This at least presents a clear issue. Does the Anglican Church still insist not only on government by Bishops, but on episcopal Ordination? It is easy, of course, to make out a good case for turning a blind eye to irregularities.

But the acceptance of a non-transmitted ministry is far more than an irregularity. It implies as clearly as anything can do that a transmitted ministry is a non-essential.

We must not suppose that if these proposals are carried into effect it will be the first time that the English Church has been in communion with ministers who have not been ordained by a Bishop. In the reigns of James I. and Charles I., and again in that of Charles II., the Church of Scotland had Bishops, but they do not seem to have given Holy Orders to those ministers who had been ordained by the presbyteries. But it cannot be said that either of these experiments was exactly a success, and the fact that our authorities erred in the past, if they did err, is no reason for repeating the mistake.

It seems, indeed, that if the two ministers who write in the January number of the *Review of the Churches* in the name of Presbyterianism and Wesleyanism are really representative, the component bodies of the United South India Church itself are by no means enthusiastic over the proposals. If that is so, if for no other reason, it seems unlikely that they will be put in force. But if they are, it is hardly rash to prophesy that a step will have been taken towards that regrouping of Christians which seems to be on the way. For, on the one hand, if we have in one region given up the principle that Holy Order can only be given validly (i.e., with security) by Bishops, it will become ridiculous to insist on it anywhere; and, on the other, it seems as clear as daylight that some of our Bishops would find it impossible to remain in communion with those who, with the best intentions, would have violated that Catholic system of the ministry which is the bond of unity in the Church. The Church of England, in spite of the newspapers, is not going to fall apart over a schedule of permitted alterations in the Book of Common Prayer; but tampering with Holy Order, which, once admitted, would spread like wildfire through the Church, is the surest and easiest way of splitting the whole Anglican Communion into two. It might not happen at once, but it could not be long delayed.

If this is to happen, we must be prepared to face it. In any case, the Anglican Communion as a distinct and isolated body will not last for ever. But most of us believe that, with wisdom and respect for each other's consciences, we may yet be spared to do a good work in holding together men of diverse temperaments and different opinions within the unity of the essential Catholic faith.

But we do not help matters by blurring the distinction between priest and non-priest, between the regular and the irregular pastor. Many of us are both puzzled and dismayed

by the growing practice of inviting dissenting ministers into a temporary pastoral relationship with the faithful by introducing them into the pulpits of our churches. We are puzzled: for what the Bishops agreed upon at Lambeth was that they could not approve of general schemes of exchange of pulpits, but that "a Bishop is justified in giving occasional authorization to ministers, not episcopally ordained, who in his judgment are working towards an ideal of union such as is described in their Appeal, to preach in churches within his Diocese." But it is well known that the nonconformist Churches have, one and all, refused the central practical suggestion of that Appeal, and it is really difficult to bring the constant appearance of Free Church ministers in some of our cathedral pulpits within the apparent intention of what was agreed upon in 1920. And it is not too much to say that we are also dismayed, for it really seems as though the rejection of the Catholic order and discipline is being treated as so entirely indifferent, that those who do so reject it are thought worthy to be set up as guides and teachers of the faithful in their solemn assemblies. Is it not really an insult to pulpit and pew, and to their occupants, that those who are, alas! repelled from Communion, should be asked to give spiritual guidance to the communicants of the Church?

We must not end on a note so ungracious. There are Catholic-minded men, and, what is better, ripe saints, among the leaders of the Free Churches, and we do not despair of finding ourselves once more united to them in outward unity, as we are already in the sight of God. They have already taken long and difficult steps to meet us, and we cannot but admire the honourable scruple which makes them hesitate to seek that which would give them "the authority of the whole body," lest in so doing they should seem to deny either "the commission of Christ" or "the inward call of the Spirit." We can sympathize most heartily with their contention that Episcopacy must be constitutional and not autocratic. We have not the faintest desire that their devotional traditions should be swallowed up by our own. It may be that we have only to wait for the rising tides all round us to have done their work, and we shall witness a President of the Free Church Council and an Archbishop meeting each other in the spirit of St. Chad and St. Theodore!

Meanwhile, within the English Church our duty seems clear. It is to make the most of our actual unity by real fellowship with those with whom we are already in communion, and at the same time to study appreciatively the graces so freely bestowed on others, whether Catholic or Protestant; to make

as many spiritual friendships as possible; to co-operate in all good works; so that when the time comes, not we but our grandchildren, whose outlook will doubtless be very different from ours, may be ready to make the next regrouping of Christendom a step to the final unity.

K. D. MACKENZIE.

ARCHBISHOP BRAMHALL*

JOHN BRAMHALL, Bishop of Derry under Charles I. and Primate of Ireland under Charles II., is not at all an easy subject for a biography. He was a great man; but either by defect of genius or by ill-luck he is not known as he should be known, and his works are not read as they should be read. Indeed, it is largely ill-luck. Not only were his immense energy and ability divided among a number of important actions, so that he has never become the symbolical representative of anything; but some of his most important activity was exerted upon causes which are now forgotten. As Bishop of Derry, as the lieutenant of Wentworth and Laud, he did much to reform and establish the Irish Church and to bring it into conformity with the English Church; he saw his work largely undone by Cromwell; as Primate of Ireland during the first years of Charles II. and in his old age he set to work to build it up again. Had his labours been in England instead of Ireland he might now be better remembered. His middle years were spent in exile; and perhaps it is the work he performed during these years, often in illness, danger, and vicissitudes, that should earn him particular gratitude from his Church. This is a chapter of Church history which is too little known; few people realize how nearly in those years the English Church came to perishing utterly, or realize that had the Commonwealth survived a few years longer the Church would have fallen into a disorder from which it might never have recovered. During the exile Bramhall was the stoutest inheritor of the tradition of Andrewes and Laud.

Dr. Sparrow-Simpson has treated the history of Bramhall's career in Ireland and his activities abroad during the Commonwealth fully, but with a proper sense of proportion. He leaves himself space to devote several chapters to Bramhall's controversial writings; he is specially to be praised for the skill with which he has digested these writings and condensed and organized so much various information into two hundred and fifty-one pages. With the purely historical matter I am not competent

* *Archbishop Bramhall*. By W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, D.D. (In the English Theologians Series.) S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

to deal; Bramhall's life includes an important part of the history of the Church and the history of England. But there is still much interest to be found in Bramhall's writings, and some of them are very much to the point at the present day. One part of his work that is of particular importance is his controversy with Hobbes. It is sometimes cited by historians of philosophy, but has never received the attention it deserves. Bramhall, as Dr. Sparrow-Simpson points out, had by no means the worst of the argument, and the whole debate, with the two striking and opposed personalities engaged in it, throws light upon the condition of philosophy and theology at that time. The most important of the questions at issue are two: the freedom of the will and the relation between Church and State.

Thomas Hobbes was one of those extraordinary little upstarts whom the chaotic motions of the Renaissance tossed into an eminence which they hardly deserved and have never lost. When I say the Renaissance I mean for this purpose the period between the decay of scholastic philosophy and the rise of modern science. The thirteenth century had the gift of philosophy, or reason; the later seventeenth century had the gift of mathematics, or science; but the period between had ceased to be rational without having learned to be scientific. Three men who are typical of this interim epoch are Machiavelli, Montaigne, and Hobbes. Machiavelli is so much the greatest of these three (and in some ways so much more mediæval) that it is a pity that he must be included with the others; but he is guilty of the same type of error. It is characteristic of all these men that their ideas are often right and sometimes profound; but that they are always one-sided and imperfect. They are therefore typical heresiarchs; for the essence of heresy is not so much the presentation of new and false notions, as the isolation and exaggeration of ideas which are true in themselves but which require completion and compensation. Hobbes, like Machiavelli and Montaigne, did not invent errors; he merely forced certain ideas as far as they can be made to go; his great weakness was lack of balance. Such men have an historical justification, for they show us the points at which we shall arrive if we go far enough in directions in which it is not desirable to go.

There was nothing particularly new about the determinism of Hobbes; but he gave to his determinism and theory of sense perception a new point and piquancy by applying it, so to speak, almost to topical questions; and by his metaphor of Leviathan he provided an ingenious framework on which there was some peg or other to hang every question of philosophy, psychology, government, and economics.

Hobbes shows considerable ingenuity and determination in his attempt to carry out his theory of the Will rigorously to explain the whole and every aspect of human behaviour. It is certain that in the end he lands himself in sophistries. But at the time of Hobbes and Bramhall, and indeed ever since until recently, it was impossible that a controversy on this subject should keep to the point. For a philosopher like Hobbes has already a mixed attitude, partly philosophic and partly scientific; the philosophy being in decay and the science immature. Hobbes's philosophy is not so much a philosophy as it is an adumbration of the universe of material atoms regulated by laws of motion which formed the scientific view of the world from Newton to Einstein. Hence there is quite naturally no place in Hobbes's universe for the human will; what he failed to see is that there was no place in it for consciousness either, or for human beings. So his only philosophical theory is a theory of sense perception, and his psychology leaves no place in the world for his theory of government. His theory of government has no philosophic basis: it is merely a collection of discrete opinions, prejudices, and genuine reflections upon experience which are given a spurious unity by a shadowy metaphysic.

The attitude of Hobbes toward moral philosophy has by no means disappeared from human thought; nor has the confusion between moral philosophy and a mechanistic psychology. There is a modern theory, closely akin to that of Hobbes, which would make value reside entirely in the degree of organization of natural impulses. I cite the following passage from an important book by one of the most acute of younger psychologists:

"Anything is valuable which will satisfy an appetency without involving the frustration of some equal or more important appetency; in other words, the only reason which can be given for not satisfying a desire is that more important desires will thereby be thwarted. Thus morals become purely prudential, and ethical codes merely the expression of the most general schemes of expediency to which an individual or a race has attained."—Richards: *Principles of Literary Criticism*, p. 48.

And Mr. Bertrand Russell, in his book, *What I Believe*, p. 43, sings the same tune:

"The Practical need of morals arises from the conflict of desires, whether of different people or of the same person at different times or even at one time. A man desires to drink, and also to be fit for his work next morning. We think him immoral if he adopts the course which gives him the smaller total satisfaction of desire."

The difficulty with such theories* is that they merely remove the inherently valuable a further degree; just as Hobbes's

* A thoroughgoing "Behaviourism," as of Professor Watson, is a very different affair.

Theory of Will removes freedom from the individual considered as the object of psychology, but really implies the reality of freewill in society. It will be remembered that Hobbes wished to maintain the activity of human legislation in his deterministic universe; so he considered that law acts as a deterrent force. He did not consider that if human laws themselves are created by the same necessity under which human beings act when encouraged or deterred by the laws, then the whole system ceases to have any meaning, and all values, including his own value of good government, disappear.

It should not be expected that the arguments advanced by Bramhall against this position should appear very powerful when contrasted with those of modern disciples of Hobbes. But in their own time and place they were excellent. I disregard that part of Bramhall's reasoning which consists in showing that Hobbes's system was incompatible with Christianity. Hobbes was here in a very weak position of which the Bishop with praiseworthy slyness took full advantage. Hobbes was undoubtedly an atheist and could hardly have been unconscious of the fact; but he was no Spinoza, and would hardly have been willing to sacrifice his worldly prospects for the sake of establishing consistency in his argument. Therefore he has always the worst of the debate. But this is a minor point. Bramhall was able to meet Hobbes also on his own ground. His method of attack illustrates very clearly his type of mind. It was not a subtle mind: it had not the refinement necessary to make a scholastic metaphysician, nor was it the mind of a doctor of the Church who could develop and explicate the meaning of a dogma. It was essentially common sense and right instinct, a mind not gifted to discover truth but tenacious to hold it. It was typical of the best theological minds of that age. Hobbes suffers from not only a tactical but a real disadvantage in his confusion of the spheres of psychology and ethics. Bramhall is single-minded; he does not penetrate the real philosophical incoherence of Hobbes's position; but he touches the point of practical importance and implies the profounder objection to Hobbes when he says simply that Hobbes makes praise and blame meaningless. "If a man be born blind or with one eye, we do not blame him for it; but if a man have lost his sight by his intemperance, we blame him justly." This objection is finally unanswerable.

I have asserted that Hobbes's psychological analysis of the human mind has no rational connection with his theory of the State. But it has, of course, an emotional connection; one can say that both doctrines belong naturally to the same temperament. Materialistic determinism and absolutist government fit into the same *Weltanschauung*. And this theory of the State

shows the same lack of balance which I affirmed to be a general characteristic of the philosophers of the Renaissance. Hobbes merely exaggerates one aspect of the good State. In doing so he developed a particularly lamentable theory of the relation between Church and State.

There is no question to which a man like Hobbes can give a less satisfactory answer than that of Church and State. For Hobbes thought in extremes, and in this problem the extreme is always wrong. In the relation of Church and State, a doctrine when pushed to the extreme may even be transformed to the opposite of itself. Hobbes has something in common with Suarez.

Bramhall's position on this subject is characteristic of his sense of realities and his ability to grasp what was expedient. He had also what Hobbes lacked, the historical sense, which is a gift not only of the historian, but of the efficient lawyer, statesman, or theologian. His account of the relations of the English kings with the Papacy, from the earliest times, and his selection of parallels from the history of continental Europe, show both wide knowledge and great skill in argument. His thinking is a perfect example of the pursuit of the *via media*, and the *via media* is of all ways the most difficult to follow. It requires discipline and self-control, it requires both imagination and hold on reality. In a period of debility like our own, few men have the energy to follow the middle way in government; for lazy or tired minds there is only extremity or apathy: dictatorship or communism, with enthusiasm or with indifference. An able Conservative writer, Mr. Keith Feiling, in his *England under the Tudors and Stewarts*, refers to Hobbes as "the acutest thinker of the age." It would be equally true to say that he is the most eminent example in his age of a particularly lazy type of thinker. At any rate, the age owes a very great part of its distinction, both in England and in France, to thinkers of wholly the opposite type to Hobbes.

The French Church in the time of Louis XIV. ("*il fut gallicain, ce siècle, et janseniste*") resembled the English Church under the Stuarts in several respects. In both countries a strong and autocratic civil Government controlled and worked with a strongly national Church. In each country there was a certain balance of power; in France between the throne and the papacy; in England an internal balance of power between strong personalities. There was much in common between Bramhall and Bossuet. But between Bramhall and Hobbes there is no sympathy whatever. Superficially their theories of the kingship bear some resemblance to each other. Both men were violently hostile to democracy in any form or degree. Both men believed that the monarch should have absolute

Theory of Will removes freedom from the individual considered as the object of psychology, but really implies the reality of freewill in society. It will be remembered that Hobbes wished to maintain the activity of human legislation in his deterministic universe; so he considered that law acts as a deterrent force. He did not consider that if human laws themselves are created by the same necessity under which human beings act when encouraged or deterred by the laws, then the whole system ceases to have any meaning, and all values, including his own value of good government, disappear.

It should not be expected that the arguments advanced by Bramhall against this position should appear very powerful when contrasted with those of modern disciples of Hobbes. But in their own time and place they were excellent. I disregard that part of Bramhall's reasoning which consists in showing that Hobbes's system was incompatible with Christianity. Hobbes was here in a very weak position of which the Bishop with praiseworthy slyness took full advantage. Hobbes was undoubtedly an atheist and could hardly have been unconscious of the fact; but he was no Spinoza, and would hardly have been willing to sacrifice his worldly prospects for the sake of establishing consistency in his argument. Therefore he has always the worst of the debate. But this is a minor point. Bramhall was able to meet Hobbes also on his own ground. His method of attack illustrates very clearly his type of mind. It was not a subtle mind: it had not the refinement necessary to make a scholastic metaphysician, nor was it the mind of a doctor of the Church who could develop and explicate the meaning of a dogma. It was essentially common sense and right instinct, a mind not gifted to discover truth but tenacious to hold it. It was typical of the best theological minds of that age. Hobbes suffers from not only a tactical but a real disadvantage in his confusion of the spheres of psychology and ethics. Bramhall is single-minded; he does not penetrate the real philosophical incoherence of Hobbes's position; but he touches the point of practical importance and implies the profounder objection to Hobbes when he says simply that Hobbes makes praise and blame meaningless. "If a man be born blind or with one eye, we do not blame him for it; but if a man have lost his sight by his intemperance, we blame him justly." This objection is finally unanswerable.

I have asserted that Hobbes's psychological analysis of the human mind has no rational connection with his theory of the State. But it has, of course, an emotional connection; one can say that both doctrines belong naturally to the same temperament. Materialistic determinism and absolutist government fit into the same *Weltanschauung*. And this theory of the State

shows the same lack of balance which I affirmed to be a general characteristic of the philosophers of the Renaissance. Hobbes merely exaggerates one aspect of the good State. In doing so he developed a particularly lamentable theory of the relation between Church and State.

There is no question to which a man like Hobbes can give a less satisfactory answer than that of Church and State. For Hobbes thought in extremes, and in this problem the extreme is always wrong. In the relation of Church and State, a doctrine when pushed to the extreme may even be transformed to the opposite of itself. Hobbes has something in common with Suarez.

Bramhall's position on this subject is characteristic of his sense of realities and his ability to grasp what was expedient. He had also what Hobbes lacked, the historical sense, which is a gift not only of the historian, but of the efficient lawyer, statesman, or theologian. His account of the relations of the English kings with the Papacy, from the earliest times, and his selection of parallels from the history of continental Europe, show both wide knowledge and great skill in argument. His thinking is a perfect example of the pursuit of the *via media*, and the *via media* is of all ways the most difficult to follow. It requires discipline and self-control, it requires both imagination and hold on reality. In a period of debility like our own, few men have the energy to follow the middle way in government; for lazy or tired minds there is only extremity or apathy: dictatorship or communism, with enthusiasm or with indifference. An able Conservative writer, Mr. Keith Feiling, in his *England under the Tudors and Stewarts*, refers to Hobbes as "the acutest thinker of the age." It would be equally true to say that he is the most eminent example in his age of a particularly lazy type of thinker. At any rate, the age owes a very great part of its distinction, both in England and in France, to thinkers of wholly the opposite type to Hobbes.

The French Church in the time of Louis XIV. ("*il fut gallicain, ce siècle, et janseniste*") resembled the English Church under the Stuarts in several respects. In both countries a strong and autocratic civil Government controlled and worked with a strongly national Church. In each country there was a certain balance of power; in France between the throne and the papacy; in England an internal balance of power between strong personalities. There was much in common between Bramhall and Bossuet. But between Bramhall and Hobbes there is no sympathy whatever. Superficially their theories of the kingship bear some resemblance to each other. Both men were violently hostile to democracy in any form or degree. Both men believed that the monarch should have absolute

power. Bramhall affirmed the divine right of kings: Hobbes rejected this noble but untenable faith, and asserted in effect the divine right of power, however come by. But Bramhall's view is not so absurdly romantic, or Hobbes's so soundly reasonable, as might seem. To Bramhall the king himself was a kind of symbol, and his assertion of divine right was a way of laying upon the king a double responsibility. It meant that the king had not merely a civil but a religious obligation toward his people. And the kingship of Bramhall is less absolute than the kingship of Hobbes. For Hobbes the Church was merely a department of the State, to be run exactly as the king thought best. Bramhall does not tell us clearly what would be the duties of a private citizen if the king should violate or overturn the Christian religion, but he obviously leaves a wide expedient margin for resistance or justified rebellion. It is curious that the system of Hobbes, as Dr. Sparrow-Simpson has observed, not only insists on autocracy but tolerates *unjustified* revolution. Hobbes's theory is in some ways very near to that of Machiavelli, with this important exception, that he has none of Machiavelli's profound observation and none of Machiavelli's limiting wisdom. The sole test and justification for Hobbes is in the end merely material success. For Hobbes all standards of good and evil are frankly relative.

It is extraordinary that a philosophy so essentially revolutionary as that of Hobbes, and so similar to that of contemporary Russia, should ever have been supposed to give any support to Toryism. But its ambiguity is largely responsible for its success. Hobbes was a revolutionary in thought and a timid conservative in action; and his theory of government is congenial to that type of person who is conservative from prudence but revolutionary in his dreams. This type of person is not altogether uncommon. In Hobbes there are symptoms of the same mentality as Nietzsche: his belief in violence is a confession of weakness. Hobbes's violence is of a type that often appeals to gentle people. His specious effect of unity between a very simple theory of sense perception and an equally simple theory of government is of a kind that will always be popular because it appears to be intellectual but is really emotional, and therefore very soothing to lazy minds.

Bramhall's abilities of thought and language are nowhere better displayed than in his *Just Vindication of the English Church*. As for the language of Bramhall, I think that Dr. Sparrow-Simpson does him less than justice. It is true that he employs in his vocabulary the most extraordinary confections of Latinity, but the catalogue of some of these expressions which Dr. Sparrow-Simpson gives would lead one to believe that they

occur in every sentence. And although Bramhall is not an easy writer, his phrases are lucid and direct and occasionally have real beauty and rhythm. A theologian of his powers, at that period of English prose, a man trained on the theology and the style of Bishop Andrewes, could hardly fail to write prose of distinction.

"Every sudden passionate heat or misunderstanding or shaking of charity amongst Christians, though it were even between the principal pastors of the Church, is not presently schism. As that between Saint Paul and Barnabas in the Acts of the Apostles—who dare say that either of them were schismatic? or that between Saint Hierome and Ruffinus, who charged one another mutually with heresy; or that between Saint Chrysostom and Epiphanius, who refused to join in prayers; Saint Chrysostom wishing that Epiphanius might never return home alive, and Epiphanius wishing that Saint Chrysostom might not die a Bishop; both which things, by the just disposition of Almighty God, fell out according to the passionate and uncharitable desires of these holy persons; who had Christian charity still radicated in their hearts, though the violent torrent of sudden passion did for a time bear down all other respects before it."

This is rather heavy going, and the word "radicated" is one of those blemishes to which Dr. Sparrow-Simpson calls attention; but the style has distinction. In prose style, as well as in theology, Bramhall is a link between the generation of Andrewes and the generation of Jeremy Taylor. The prose of Bramhall is great prose only in the sense that it is good prose of a great epoch. I cannot believe that Bramhall was a great preacher. Andrewes and Donne and Taylor had a poetic sensibility; that is to say, they had the sensitiveness necessary to record and to bring to convergence on a theological point a multitude of fleeting but universal human feelings. They knew how to relate human passions with religious thought. Hence their words linger and echo in the mind as Bramhall's never do; we forget Bramhall's phrases the moment we turn away from Bramhall's subject.

But for *ordonnance*, logical arrangement, for mastery of every fact relevant to a thesis, Bramhall is surpassed only by Hooker; and I am not sure that in the structure of the *Just Vindication of the English Church* he does not surpass even Hooker. And this book is no antiquity; it is a work which ought to be studied by anyone to whom the relation of Church and State is an actual and importunate problem. There could hardly be a greater difference than that between the situation during the first half of the seventeenth century and the situation today. Yet the differences are such as to make the work of Bramhall the more pertinent to our problems. For they are differences in relation to a fundamental unity of thought between Bramhall, and what he represents, and ourselves.

T. S. ELIOT.

A CENTURY AND A HALF OF AN INDIAN PARISH

THIS year Parliament is considering the disestablishment of the Church of England in India. This is the end of an epoch. The measure may rouse some interest in readers of THEOLOGY in that Church. This year the Church of St. Luke's, Dinapore, Bihar, celebrates its centenary, and an outline of the history of the parish may show a little of Indian Church life in the past.

Bishop Chatterton's excellent *History of the Church of England in India* covers the field, but a word as to the system under which the church of Dinapore has been served must be said.

The East India Company, born in 1599 in the sturdy Puritanism of the City of London, always recognized a duty to provide for the spiritual needs of its servants, and appointed chaplains from 1612, originally to each "venture," then to each "factory," and finally to selected stations. These chaplains were servants of the Company, and that body paid, appointed, and discharged them. The Crown, in 1858, took over the system which in outline remains today. The bishops were appointed in 1814 (Calcutta) as the supervisors of the chaplains for the local governments, and Government at their motion appoints chaplains to particular stations. Indian ecclesiastical chaplains are not military chaplains, but 60 per cent. of stations served by them are military stations, and troops have the first charge on them.

Into the merits and demerits of the system the writer does not enter; it is enough to say it has provided Dinapore with clergy since 1767.

Dinapore means "the town on the right hand," and is a military station eight miles west of Patna, an important city on the Ganges, near its junction with the River Sone from the south, and Gogra and Gandak from the north. Patna was always a turbulent city, and the rivers before the railway were the highways of communications. This probably dictated the building in 1767 of a military station at Dinapore.

The work of Rev. H. B. Hyde, chaplain in 1887, who collected in MSS. the records of the parish, using oral traditions now lost, alone makes a connected account of the little-known early years possible. Two existing squares of barracks were built in 1767, and have always had troops in them since. The first chaplain was posted here in 1774, but nothing is known of the work till 1806. Scattered notices of early years exist, the first

CENTURY AND A HALF OF AN INDIAN PARISH 19

being the collection of money in 1770 in Dinapore to feed the starving in a great Bihar famine. The *Calcutta Gazette* of 1775 records the trial of a Dinapore officer for the shooting of a brother officer in a duel. No evidence was offered, and he was discharged, a striking example of public opinion at the time. The tomb of the unfortunate duellist is in the cemetery; its inscription records the "general regret of the community at his untimely death."

In 1798 the *Gazette* published a proposal from a Mrs. Middleton to start a girls' school in "the airy, healthy, and agreeable station of Dinapore." Every attention was to be paid to health, morals, and learning. The study course included Latin, French, writing, arithmetic, plain and fancy needlework, and the fees were: boarders, 32 rupees, and day-girls, 8 rupees per mensem (*i.e.*, £2 8s. and 12s. respectively). (N.B.—1s. 6d. to the rupee is taken as ratio throughout this article.) Mrs. Middleton probably aimed at something very like Thackeray's immortal Academy of Chiswick Mall, and one wonders how far she reproduced it; but the records are silent.

In December, 1805, the "King's" 53rd Foot (now 1st King's Shropshire Light Infantry) arrived at Dinapore. They are stationed here today, and the Colonel has lent the author the diary of Henry Sherwood, Captain and Paymaster, kept in Dinapore 1805-06. Sherwood mentions engaging twelve servants, "not really enough," and says Dinapore was one of the cheapest places in India to live in. His list of bazaar prices makes the housewife of today gasp. No wonder men made money in an India where one paid 12 annas for a sheep! The 53rd were at Dinapore December, 1805, to July, 1806. In that time they lost over 100 men by death, according to the Regimental History of 1845, though the St. John's, Calcutta, record of burials gives forty-eight of all ranks. This is, to modern standards, a heavy list. (The last regiment in Dinapore, the Cheshires, had three deaths in two years.)

Mrs. Sherwood, Captain Sherwood's wife, also a diarist, was the author of *Little Henry and His Bearer*, the first Anglo-Indian children's book. She was a strong Evangelical, with the practical piety of that school, and Hannah More's work at Cheddar was reproduced in Dinapore when Mrs. Sherwood, struck with the neglected condition of the many soldiers' children at Dinapore, for whom no provision was as yet made by the Army, began a school for them in her own house. It was attended by about forty daily. Mrs. Sherwood was the only teacher, assisted by her husband's clerk, Sergeant Clerk, whose main duty was "to beat the children in the back verandah when they used bad language."

In 1805 Dinapore was apparently without a chaplain, and the 53rd moved to Berhampore before its only famous minister arrived. This was Henry Martyn, Senior Wrangler, Fellow of St. John's, Cambridge, the friend and pupil of Simeon. Martyn's Life has often been written, especially by Miss Padwick; his activities can only be outlined here. His tenure of the chaplaincy was from November 22, 1806, to April, 1809. He had no church, and held service "on the square" and in his own house. He worked indefatigably among the troops, the women attached to them, the officers, and the Indians of the bazaars of Patna, Bankipur (a suburb of Patna), and Dinapore. In these three places he founded schools. He worked at Urdu, Persian, and Sanskrit, and at Dinapore finished the first draft of the Urdu New Testament, and an Urdu version of the Book of Common Prayer. This began with the Marriage Service done in one day for a "Portuguese couple," probably poor Eurasians, who knew no English. His first Hindustani service on March 15, 1807, was attended by 200 people, mostly women belonging to the regiments. It was then the custom for English soldiers to marry Indian women; men came out young with no prospects of returning home and married in India. The registers of older Indian stations are full of these unions. They cannot be held "illicit," though from shortage of clergy and differences of creed they were often very "irregular." The result was the Anglo-Indian or Eurasian community today.

The state of India is shown by the fact that when in February he was called for a marriage at Buxar, a fort seventy miles from Dinapore, he made his will before venturing on the journey; he travelled by palanquin, a litter carried by bearers, starting at 3.30 a.m., February 16, and reached his destination 9 a.m., February 17, and returned in safety.

Martyn apparently took up the question of the church accommodation at Dinapore. Lord Minto, the Governor-General, called for a return of the congregation—which Martyn estimated at 1700—and a quarter was assigned for a church in 1809. It was 81 feet long, with a verandah. Martyn says: "It will make a noble church." It is the garrison theatre today.

In October, 1807, the Sherwoods enjoyed Martyn's hospitality while going to Cawnpore. They were likeminded people, and the friendship was later of great value to him as Martyn was transferred to Cawnpore in 1809, and was chaplain to the 53rd there. The Sherwoods nursed him in his many attacks of fever. Martyn left India in 1812 and died at Tokat, Armenia, October 16, 1812, aged thirty-two. A lasting memorial of him in Dinapore is a handsome set of communion plate, given the station

in 1810 by the Company. Martyn probably applied for it, but it arrived too late for his use.

When Martyn died in Armenia, Dinapore was in the throes of terror, as a body of Pindaris—banditti of all the “broken clans” of Central India—about 12,000 strong, plundered Chapra, about thirty miles from Dinapore, crossed the Ganges and moved south. The inhabitants fled into the station in terror, and the troops got ready, but the raiders moved off up the Sone Valley, doing no more damage.

In 1814 Thomas Middleton was consecrated Bishop of Calcutta. His diocese was India and Australia. As Charles Lamb puts it, “he bore his mitre high.” (Purely in metaphor, as neither he nor his successors in the see have ever worn one.) His attachment for ecclesiastical form was shown by his refusal—as recorded by Heber—to hold a confirmation on his only visit to Dinapore, 1819, because no “consecrated church existed.” Nothing else is known of the first episcopal visit.

Very different is the case of his successor, Reginald Heber, who came on August 24, 1824. His diary gives full details both of doings and impressions. Heber drove from Bankipur in a carriage. The Archdeacon was carried in a “tonjon,” a sort of litter with a hood, still used in Bihar for Hindu marriage processions, though now giving way, where there are roads, to the all-conquering “Ford.” He says the station had a “King’s” and a “Company’s” regiment with numerous artillery. Heber says the moral tone of the former was much the better, and ascribed it to the early age the Company’s men left England. Of the church he says: “Everything is on a liberal scale except what belongs to the church and the spiritual life of the inhabitants. The former I found merely a small and inconvenient room in barracks, which seemed to be as if it had been designed as a hospital ward. The reading-desk, surplice, books, all mean and shabbier than the poorest village chapel in England or Wales. There were no punkahs, no lamps, no glass in the windows, and till a paltry deal desk was brought for my use from an adjacent warehouse, no communion table.”

Heber had fourteen confirmation candidates and a small congregation. He seems to have had neither parade service nor celebration. Matters were in a bad way, partly from the bad conduct of the late chaplain, partly from the lack of any decent church accommodation. Bishop and chaplain were both depressed, “to which the heat of the day, the most oppressive I have yet known in India, greatly contributed.”

The bishop left next day, the artillery firing a salute in his honour. In 1826 Dinapore had no chaplain for several months. The General’s A.D.C. acted as chaplain and “married” a

couple. They and four others similarly "married" were "remarried" on the chaplain's arrival later in the year. Heber had evidently stirred Government, for a church was built in 1827-31. The architects were two officers of infantry, and it cost 24,710 rupees (about £1,870). Government made a grant, and private subscriptions did the rest. Dr. Leighton Pullan is rather sarcastic in his Bampton Lectures on the fact that English churches in India copy English not Indian models. He has never been an exile, I think. Dinapore was a copy of St. John's, Calcutta, which in its turn was a deliberate copy of the "classical" style of Wren and his school, seen in many Georgian English churches. With large windows such as St. John's and Dinapore have, it is an excellent type, in the opinion of the writer, for the conditions of English people in India. It is perhaps worth noting that the contemporary church of St. Peter's, Fort William, is a deliberate copy of the Eton College chapel; its architect was a captain of Bengal Engineers, and an old Etonian. It anticipates the Gothic revival in England. Dinapore was opened in 1831, and consecrated on the next episcopal visit by Bishop Daniel Wilson, November 11, 1837 (St. Martin's Day). It was dedicated to St. Luke. Till service registers begin in 1845 little is recorded, though the burial registers hint at forgotten tragedies—*e.g.*, "a child buried, found in a half-sunken boat apparently going to Cawnpore." And a tablet in the church commemorates the loss in a hurricane on the Ganges on September 6, 1842, of sixty-one officers, men and women of the 61st Regiment (2nd Gloucesters).

With the advent of the register of services more can be traced. At the first Holy Week services recorded the average attendance was forty-five. In 1847 a monthly Sacrament replaced the quarterly, and an "early" Sacrament at 10 a.m., instead of after parade service at 11, shows the tendencies of the time. An evening communion makes a short-lived appearance in 1853. These all show the influence of English movements.

From 1856 to 1858 the Rev. Milward R. Burge was chaplain of Dinapore. His son, who was afterwards Bishop of Southwark and Oxford (died July, 1925), was not born at Dinapore. Mr. Burge was chaplain in the Sepoy Mutiny. The Church records dismiss it thus: "June 7th, Sunday: No evening service, in consequence of excitement among the native troops." "July 27th: No service. Troops gone to Arrah." Otherwise service went on as usual.

On June 7 a carefully planned simultaneous rising in Patna and Dinapore was only frustrated by an accident and the prompt action of Mr. Taylor, the Commissioner of Patna. The omission of service on the second date was due to the fact that

three native infantry regiments had risen the week before and gone to Arrah, about thirty-eight miles away, where they proclaimed a local chief king, and besieged the civil officers in a small house in the Judges' compound. This was held by fifteen Englishmen and fifty Sikhs (45th Sikhs Rattrays) for a week. On Sunday, July 27, troops from Dinapore tried to relieve them, but they were ambushed, and only about 50 of 200 men got back. Arrah was relieved by Major Vincent Eyre from Buxar, with a very small force, when on the point of starvation, August 2, 1857. Some English girls were carried off from Dinapore into harems of Patna city and lost. One was discovered by a missionary lady doctor in 1922 in extreme old age, and quite unaware of her race. A survivor of the Cawnpore siege—aged eight in 1857—still lives in Dinapore cantonments.

With Mr. Burge's successor the influence of the Oxford Movement was first felt. A newcomer to India, "he read himself in with the Thirty-Nine Articles"—the only time this has been done. Daily offices, Saint's Day celebrations, including an evening Communion on Ascension Day (probably a concession to Bihar hot weather), a Wednesday evening service and sermon, all show the influence of new standards. One Wednesday service was omitted in consequence of the "execution of a young soldier aged nineteen."

The church was completed in 1862, a porch, vestry, and tower being added; the architect was a doctor, and the work is in harmony with the whole. It cost 3,700 rupees (about £275). In 1861 the S.P.G. began a mission in Patna, service being held in the church in Hindi, carried on by a series of catechists till a small brick church was built. This lasted ten years and was then washed away by a flood. The mission had as deacon in charge Elahi Baksh, a convert of Bishop Valpy French of Lahore, and this flourished for a time, but was at last abandoned when the S.P.G. retired from Patna in favour of the Baptist mission.

In 1866 new "Queen's" colours were consecrated at Dinapore for the 105th Light Infantry, formerly Bombay Light Infantry, and now 2nd K.O.Y.L.I. These are the only colours consecrated at the station.

The advent of the East India Railway caused a settlement of railwaymen at Kargoul, Dinapore station, four miles off. Services began there in 1865.

In 1872 a census was taken, the Christians of Dinapore being:

1872, in barracks, 1,630 persons.	1927, in barracks, about 680.
1872, in station, 108.	1927, in town, about 50.
1872, in Kargoul, 214.	1927, in Kargoul, about 400.

A new altar was given the church in 1876, and is still used; it replaced the "odd flyleaf of a dining-table," in use since 1831. The donor was Father S. W. O'Neil, founder of the "Cowley" Fathers in India. The writer remembers first hearing of him from Fr. V. S. S. Coles, by the fireside of a Devonshire rectory, and how, on his matriculation at Cambridge, the Registrar, seeing "Simeon Wilberforce O'Neil" entered in the record, said: "Mr. O'Neil, you have two great names." "Three, Mr. Registrar," replied O'Neil.

It was probably the fact that Martyn was connected with Simeon like O'Neil which led to his gift to Dinapore.

In 1893 growth of population at Kargoul led to a church being built there; it was intended to dedicate it to St. Martin, but Christ Church was substituted, "certain individuals maliciously suggesting that the Bishop desired to commemorate another person also named Martyn."

Little history has been made of late years, though it may be mentioned that the Rev. H. Spooner, M.C., left Dinapore to be chaplain to General Townshend's Kut garrison. The 9th Middlesex came here from England, and later erected their regimental war memorial in the church "in memory of the great kindness they had from all classes and creeds of the inhabitants." A most graceful action.

Today Dinapore is the headquarters of one battalion of British infantry, less one company. Parade service is held every Sunday, Holy Communion fortnightly and on weekdays, Evensong each Sunday in the cold and fortnightly in the hot season. Continuity of work is impossible as chaplains change, from going on leave and other causes, the regiments move every two years, and band, families, and all men by turns go to the hills in the hot weather. Sunday schools, confirmation classes, etc., are all worked in the cold weather. The small civilian population is visited individually, and has its services with the troops. Congregations are on an average distinctly good.

Dinapore station has the headquarters of a division of the East India Railway. Services each Sunday, Holy Communion and Evensong alternately.

Lack of any church room makes organization difficult, but here the congregations are also good.

Buxar, about eighty miles off, and Arrah, thirty-eight miles distant, are visited monthly. "Exigencies of the service" or shortage of clergy lead at times to the doubling of Patna and Dinapore. The padre then has four main and seven out-stations to serve. Services are reduced in each, but even so the problem of continual motion is very nearly solved.

What the future will bring we know not, but the record of the past, despite difficulties, failures, and occasional lapses, is, on the whole, one of faithful work done under the blessing of God to His honour and glory, and reviewing this and facing the future "we thank God and take courage."

H. FULFORD WILLIAMS.

Chaplain of Dinapore.

ON RELIGIOUS ORTHOGRAPHY

SOMEWHAT over a year ago a correspondent drew our attention to a discussion in the *Times Literary Supplement* on a subject of "Reverence Capitals," and invited us to give some guidance to our readers as to the correctness, in particular, of the present-day custom of writing "Our Lord" with a capital O. It was not easy at that time to accede to the request; but the subject has since been germinating in our mind, and the opening of the eighth year of this Journal's life seems an occasion when some discussion of this aspect of religious orthography as a whole might not be inopportune. Let us say at once that we make no claim to speak infallibly on the matter; the affair is too complicated, and the area of legitimate liberty too wide, for any laying down of the law. Any thorough treatment of the subject would involve researches far beyond our competence, such as an analysis of the usage of English prose-writers generally at different periods of history and a comparison of the methods of different theological writers, schools, and traditions in each age. Such a study would require a monograph of some size. Nevertheless, there is a place for humbler essays; and seven years of editorial experience, and of experience not only confined to this Journal, affords one perhaps some material for forming judgments on different orthographical fashions, and some opportunity for testing such principles as he had happened to glean in earlier days.

To begin, then, with a general maxim. It seems to us a sound principle that in all writing capital letters should be always reduced to a minimum. They devour both space and time—the author's space and the printer's time—and are therefore costly; and they produce an atmosphere of restlessness, of straining after effect, almost of deception, which distracts instead of concentrating the mind. Time was, of course, when our ancestors honoured almost every noun with a capital, and the manuscript letters of a century ago make handsome reading.

But convention has changed; and both capitals and underlining of words have come to be at once more rare and more significant. It is this fact of significance which makes it important that we should use them with reserve and on some principle; and in religious writing, where sincerity is even more valuable than signs of reverence, this need of reserve is at its greatest.

Fortunately we have in the Bible a great exemplar; and, though we shall consider in a moment reasons for departing from its practice in certain cases, we cannot do better than take its principles as our basis. Proper names and initial words apart, the Bible uses capitals only in the case of names and titles of the Persons of the Blessed Trinity. Thus we have Lord, Christ, Holy Ghost, Spirit, Holy One of Israel. In the case of Spirit, the capital is confined to such cases as are reckoned to refer certainly to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity; we find it, for example, in Gal. v. 22 (the fruit of the Spirit), but not in Phil. i. 27 (stand fast in one spirit). In Son of man, again, the capital is given to the first word of the title only. A curious testimony to the impressiveness of this parsimony in the use of capitals lies in the fact that it is even more thorough-going in our modern editions of the Authorized Version than it was in the two original issues of 1611. In Gen. i., for example, the 1611 editions give a capital to "earth" not only in v. 10, where it is a proper name, but also in vv. 1 and 11 (though not in v. 12); while divine attributes such as the "image" of God in Gen. i. 26 or His "name" in Job. i. 21, are spelt with capitals; and in 2 Sam. xxiii. 15, we read "the Well of Bethlehem." As time has passed, the principle of reserve in capitals has evidently commended itself so strongly that future editors have sought to apply it with an even greater consistency and thoroughness than the first translators.

There is something majestically simple in this biblical usage; but there are reasons why what is suitable there would not be so suitable everywhere. The purpose of capital letters is to emphasize a distinction of some kind; but in a book whose every page is the Word of God, and whose every line should be read with an equal reverence, there is no reason to depart from the ordinary rules of English orthography which govern their use. When we pass, however, to books of Christian devotion or theology, we are on different ground. We shall best see the change, perhaps, if we consider the practice of the Book of Common Prayer, which may be broadly summarized as follows:

1. In the Epistles and Gospels, the use of capitals would appear to conform broadly to that found in Scripture; though there is not consistency even here, and such phrases as "the

Word of God" and "the Son of Man" appear with a capital for each noun.*

2. In the prayers, capitals are much more widely used *e.g.* for such words as Apostles, Church, etc.; and in some cases, but not in all, for such terms as *e.g.* Incarnation (in the Litany, but not in the Collect for Lady Day) or Resurrection (in the Litany and Proper Preface for Easter Day, but not in the Collect for Lady Day).

3. Capitals are used with certain adjectives—*e.g.*, "Catholick" and "Apostolick" in the Creed, "Everlasting" in the Preface, "Divine Majesty" in the Confession. In the first two of these cases the reason for the capital would appear to be doctrinal; in the last two the adjective no less than the noun belongs to the title.

4. What can only be called "reverence capitals" are used, *e.g.*, "thy Servant George our King," "Table," "Supper," "Bread," "Body."

5. Capitals are, however, never extended to any pronouns whatever, even when they refer to God.

It will be seen that there is not only wide variety of usage in the Prayer Book, but also considerable inconsistency as well. Two main causes seem to have operated to produce divergence from scriptural custom. One is the fact that many of the terms used in Scripture itself have become *theologoumena*—*i.e.*, technical terms or titles, charged with a certain preciseness of doctrinal content, often as a result of controversy; and this fact leads to their being naturally distinguished by capitals. The other is the desire to evoke reverence, and to show that some ordinary word is being used not in its ordinary sense, but in a sense or

* The following table will show how much variety there is in one passage taken at random out of the Epistle for the 5th Sunday after Epiphany, Col. iii. 16 f.

A.V. (1611).	A.V. (Modern).	Prayer Book (1662).	Deposited Book.
Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another in Psalmes, and Hymnes, and Spirituall songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord. And whatsoever yee doe . . . all in the Name of the Lord Jesus.	Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord. And whatsoever ye do . . . all in the name of the Lord Jesus.	Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord. And whatsoever . . . all in the Name of the Lord Jesus.	Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord. And whatsoever ye do . . . all in the name of the Lord Jesus.

context which is peculiarly sacred. In both cases the capitals have a didactic importance, serving to recall associations which have gathered round the word in the history of the Church.

Among modern religious publications, those of the Anglo-Catholic Congress seem to be almost alone in following the Prayer Book usage, both in what it allows and in what it forbids. In this the publishers are reviving a great tradition. They can appeal, for example, to the usual, if not invariable, practice of such representative divines as Hooker, Jeremy Taylor, and Bishop Butler. Yet we hesitate to say that the usage of more modern English divines is mistaken. In our own day religious writings deviate from the Prayer Book norm in one of two directions: either they recognize far fewer occasions when either doctrine or devotion calls for a capital, or they are careful to give capitals to pronouns referring to any of the Persons of the Blessed Trinity. The first of these tendencies seems to us to provide the real justification for the second. In so far as a writer may desire simply to return to the more primitive orthography of Scripture, he is probably doing a service to English prose. But it is not questionable that the refusal of capitals in some cases is intended to have a definite significance—to intimate, for example, that the writer does not believe in the Godhead of our Lord. We think, therefore, that the necessity of witnessing to the faith of the Incarnation and to the personality of the Holy Spirit makes it desirable that a capital should be used in the case of pronouns referring to the Person of the Blessed Trinity. The custom, moreover, is so firmly entrenched that it would be no light matter to alter it.

There is, however, need for care. Does this, for example, refer to all pronouns? Certainly it applies to the personal, possessive, reflexive, and interrogative pronouns; but we are very doubtful about the relative. Our own practice, based on the teaching of a very good scholar many years ago, has been never to use a capital with the relative pronoun, on the ground that the clause introduced by a relative stands in the place either of an adjective or of an adverb, neither of which would properly have a capital. We believe this to be a sound rule; and we note that it is followed by such representative writers as Rashdall and Gore.

Again, there are two modern fashions which call for comment. One is the custom of giving a capital to the pronoun "it," when it refers to the Blessed Sacrament. With every respect for the reverence which prompts this usage, we cannot think it right; for, since the pronoun is neuter in gender, its reference to the Person of our Lord is not, in any grammatical sense, direct. The other case is even more to be deprecated. It is

the affixing of a capital to the pronoun "our" in the phrase "our Lord." Perhaps only an editor is in a position to realize how common this solecism has become.* No doubt the cause is simply attraction from the capital in "Lord"; but it is a negligent usage, and tends to give an almost Byzantine stiffness to that title which above all others expresses the believer's intimate relationship to Christ.

The foregoing notes will have made it clear that, apart from modern editions of the Bible, there is a large area of accepted variety in theological orthography, and this is exemplified even in so official a book as the Book of Common Prayer. It is probable, indeed, that no writer is wholly consistent in his own usage; and, even if his manuscript is consistent, variations may be introduced in the printing and fail to be corrected in proof. To both these faults the present writer would plead guilty himself; and therefore, since he lives in a glass house, he has no intention of throwing stones. Nevertheless, he believes that something may be gained by summing up here the kind of canons which he endeavours to observe himself, and which he would like to see observed in this Journal. In regard to this second point, however, he must be largely dependent on the good-will of his contributors; for it would be too large a burden for an editor to impose orthographical uniformity with his own blue pencil on the manuscripts sent to him, and the process of doing this in proof involves considerable expense.

Our canons, then, would be somewhat as follows:

1. The necessity of emphasizing the doctrinal or devotional associations of certain words and phrases makes some departure from the biblical standard desirable; but the principle of economy in capitals remains sound.

2. Any writer or editor is entitled to claim as much latitude, even though it involves inconsistency, in the use of capitals as is found in the Book of Common Prayer. We should ourselves wish to see capitals used in the case of any *title*, whether of our Lord (*e.g.*, Son of Man, High Priest), or of a doctrine (*e.g.*, Incarnation, Atonement), or of an institution (*e.g.*, Church, Creed, Sacrament); but in cases where there is doubt whether the terms are being used in this titular sense or in some other, we should wish the principle of economy to be employed. In the case of one common phrase—viz., the kingdom of God, we believe that the small "k" best does justice to its real meaning.

3. Adjectives such as "eternal" or "divine" should not have capitals, except in such actual phrases as are found in the Prayer Book.

* Our attention was recently drawn to a particularly curious case, where in one paragraph the capital was used with "Our Lady," but not with "our Lord."

4. Pronouns, other than relative pronouns, which refer to any Person of the Blessed Trinity, should be dignified with capitals. But this does not apply to such a term as "our Lord." For the rest we doubt whether more is needed than the maxim: Never use a capital where a small letter will do.

THE EDITOR.

THE LAW AND THE DEPOSITED BOOK

THE purpose of this article is to give as simply as possible, and with such accuracy as I am capable of attaining, an account of the more obvious changes in the rights and obligations of the clergy which will be effected by the enactment of the Prayer Book Measure. It is not intended to embark upon a consideration of any nice and difficult problems of construction which a detailed criticism of certain rubrics might suggest. It is always possible to subject a new statute to abstract criticism of this kind, but experience strongly shows that defects and doubts so discovered are seldom those which are subsequently found to arise in practice. It is the duty of a conscientious draughtsman to vex his soul with self-criticism of this kind, but this attitude cannot usefully be adopted by a commentator save in exceptional circumstances.

I

First in importance I would place the fact that under the authority of the Deposited Book a great number of things, some controversial, but most quite uncontroversial, can in future be lawfully done which heretofore were technically unlawful. We may unfeignedly regret that other things are not so authorized, but in so far as legal authority is given for that which in itself we approve, I cannot easily understand the attitude of those Anglo-Catholics who treat this as a matter of indifference or even for ridicule. "Law," says the Bishop of Bombay, in relation to difficulties similar but more acute even than our own which exist in India, "ought to be a great educator of conscience. It ceases to be so when all reasonable men agree that it must be continually broken. At the same time, the continual breach or evasion of law debauches conscience and destroys discipline."* Surely this is the statement of a doctrine unquestionably catholic. In default of an infallible defining authority, it may be true that the claims of conscience are such

* *The Times*, August 30, 1923.

that the question when a man is morally justified in breaking the law must ever remain to perplex us, but when the question is whether it is a matter of importance that the law itself shall be defensible rather than indefensible, that men should act in accordance with it rather than in breach of it, no Catholic should hesitate as to his answer. Whether Catholicism is more congruous with order or anarchy is not really an open question, though some people seem so to regard it.

Nor is the view that on the whole we get on very well with things as they are more justifiable in practice than it is in theory. The wide gulf which separates the law and the practice of public worship in England is only tolerable because of the atrophy of the organs of discipline. Such atrophy is most unlikely to be permanent; no Catholic can desire that it should be. Were the ecclesiastical courts reformed so that their moral authority was indisputable, the law they would be compelled to administer would impose an intolerable burden upon all persons and parties, and not least upon Anglo-Catholics.

It is therefore a matter of real satisfaction that the lawfulness of many of the most familiar features of public worship—such, for instance, as hymns—is placed beyond question, and it is equally a matter for satisfaction but of much more importance that section 7 of the Measure should unambiguously recognize a *jus liturgicum* vested in the provincial episcopate, and a more limited right in individual bishops to authorize supplementary forms of service, and that section 9 should declare that such forms are to be deemed to be ordered by “lawful authority” within the meaning of the Declaration of Assent. There is no matter in which the practice of the Church of England and its law has been more at variance than as to the authority which might in law and did in fact exercise powers of this kind.

II

The person primarily responsible for deciding which of the alternative services shall be used in a parish church is the parish priest (General Rubric No. 5). There has been much misapprehension on this subject, but it is difficult to understand what other rule could be laid down which did not involve a revolution. We give not the ministry of the Word and Sacraments to Parochial Church Councils any more than to Princes. The right given to Parochial Church Councils by section 2 (i.) of the Measure, and by the sixth of the General Rubrics, is a right to have referred to the bishop “any question” which may arise on this subject between the council and the incumbent. The “question” must relate to “changes in the

customary arrangement and conduct of the services of the church," which changes are "sanctioned by this Book" or "authorized under this Measure." No doubt the obvious purpose of these provisions is to give some voice to the representatives of the congregation in reference to the adoption of that which is newly authorized by the deposited book. Is this the extent of their operation? Supposing the new services be duly brought into use in a particular parish, and become the "customary arrangement," is there any safeguard against their arbitrary abandonment by a new incumbent "without the good-will of the people"? It would be lamentable indeed if there were not. If it be true that the greatest wisdom has not always been displayed in this regard by Anglo-Catholics, it is equally true that incumbents of a different school, particularly after the purchase of an advowson by a party-trust, have shown the profoundest disregard for the wishes and the customs of the congregation. And in such cases there has heretofore been virtually no remedy. Now it is true that section 2 (ii.) (c) of the Measure provides that a minister shall not be obliged to use forms of service other than those of the Book of Common Prayer, but that particular provision is expressed to be "subject to the provisions of this Measure." Section 2 (i.) is one of such provisions. That section, as we have seen, is concerned with "changes authorized" by the Book or Measure. If the phrase were "services authorized," it might be said that the existing services of the Book of Common Prayer were not "authorized" either by the new book or the Measure, though I incline to the view that this is incorrect. But the word is "changes" authorized by a book which contains the whole of the old as well as the new. It therefore seems to me that a "change" from the new to the old is as much a "change authorized by this Book" as a change in the opposite direction; the book is the "authority" for the change in either case. If this be so, it manifestly confers upon Anglo-Catholic congregations a security such as they have never before had. Not only will a new incumbent be bound, *prima facie*, by any prior determination of the bishop, but, even in default of a prior determination, the matter may be referred to the bishop as and when changes are made. And, assuming this view to be well founded, such congregations will not only have some protection against the abandonment of the alternative liturgy or the disuse of the vestments, but even, as I think, against the disuse of Reservation. To cease to reserve involves a "change" both in the "customary arrangement and conduct" of the open communion, and, to a much greater extent, of the communion of the sick, and, with respect to the latter, neither

Measure nor rubric uses the term "public worship," as does section 2 (ii.) (c), but simply "conduct of the services," to which the Measure adds "of the church." Communion of the sick is manifestly a "service of the church."

III

It is very widely held that the Measure and the Rubrics of the Deposited Book greatly extend the authority of the Episcopate over public worship. This fact, if it be a fact, has been denounced by some distinguished Anglo-Catholics as though it were necessarily an evil without regard to the matters in respect of which the authority is given. This position hardly seems defensible, and affords an example of that uncatholic individualism from which the Catholic movement has been in greater peril in the present century than from all the attacks of its opponents. On the other hand, as Canon Maynard Smith points out in his *Life of Bishop Weston*, this state of mind has in the past been offset and indeed largely produced by an equally regrettable individualism manifested by not a few bishops. I am therefore disposed to scrutinize with care any new powers conferred upon bishops individually, but at the same time to look with confidence and hope to the new rules for corporate action by the provincial episcopates.

Apart from the express recognition of a bishop's power to authorize additional services and variants which merely regularizes a universal practice, the powers conferred upon individual bishops by the Book appear to be five in number, namely:

(1) To give directions as to the use of extempore prayer (p. 114).

(2) To give directions as to refusal of communion (p. 203).

(3) To require the names and ages of confirmation candidates (p. 258).

(4) As to reservation of the Holy Sacrament (p. 283).

(5) To decide when the Burial Office may not be used (p. 284).

It hardly seems that any question of principle can be raised as to (1), (3) or (5). Whatever we may think as to the permission of extempore prayer, we cannot be supposed to object to its being subject to episcopal control. Similarly as to (3), I cannot pretend much sympathy for the rigid age-limits for confirmation which some bishops impose upon their dioceses, but I apprehend that a bishop's power to refuse confirmation is, and always has been, as absolute and uncontrolled as his power to refuse ordination, and in neither case is it possible to contest his right to information as to facts not manifestly irrelevant. As to the use of the Burial Service, I am bound to say that I think the new rubric places the authority where it ought to be.

Number (2) is doubtless of much greater importance, and in principle it is objectionable. The legal theory behind the rule which confers a limited power of interlocutory excommunication upon parish priests is that, on the bishop coming to a knowledge of its exercise, he must either overrule the priest when the excommunication lapses, or approve his action *pendente lite* and direct the requisite proceedings. He cannot make the excommunication definitive or permanent by administrative action. In theory I cannot deny that justice to the person excluded requires no less. But in fact since the coercive jurisdiction of the courts over the laity fell into desuetude, the required action cannot be taken and the procedure has, in fact, broken down with lamentable results. As the facts now are, and pending a restoration of discipline, the new rubric prescribes a procedure which can be effective and under which the parish priest may be protected. and for these reasons I feel unable to condemn it.

The episcopal control of reservation is, of course, of the first importance, and, if I could bring myself to believe that a general right to reserve, without permission, now exists, I must concede a great increase in episcopal control. But I cannot attain to this view. I certainly find nothing in the Prayer Book which suggests any condemnation of it, but the theory of the Act of Uniformity is that what is not expressly sanctioned is prohibited, and this always impracticable and now obsolete theory places reservation in the same category of illegality as, but in no other than, harvest festivals, mission services, and the performance of any ceremony at the consecration of a church other than the execution of the Deed of Consecration. I cannot think the necessity of obtaining a licence to reserve too high a price to pay for deliverance from the present position. There are indeed two grave defects in the rubrics with regard to reservation, and to these we shall return.

In recording those matters in respect of which new powers are conferred upon individual bishops, no mention has been made of the seventh of the General Rubrics, since to refer to it in this connection would be wholly incorrect. This rubric with some simplification of language reproduces the last paragraph "concerning the Service of the Church" in the Book of 1662. Thus the power to direct how services prescribed by the Book shall be executed when the Book itself is silent or ambiguous has long existed, and the ecclesiastical courts have recognized it on several occasions. Very generally, however, the clergy are ignorant of its existence, which perhaps explains the apprehensions which the reappearance of the rubric has caused. I have heard a priest of vast learning speak as though the omission

of a direction in the Prayer Book for the handing back of a child to its sponsors after baptism could not, upon the strict interpretation of the Act of Uniformity, be supplied by any ecclesiastical authority whatever. This is simply untrue. Of course a direction under this rubric must not be "contrary to anything contained in this book," and the question whether a particular direction was so or not would always be open in the ecclesiastical courts. There can be no question of such a direction being "final," as a direction under the last preceding rubric as to changes in the conduct of services is declared to be. The new rubric, in addition to the qualification already mentioned, also requires that such a direction shall not be contrary "to any Rules for the conduct of publick worship in accordance with this Book which may be made from time to time by the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province." What this means we shall shortly consider, but it is worth noting that by these words the new rubric actually restrains rather than increases the power of a single bishop.

The provisions which authorize the taking of action by the archbishop and bishops of each province are manifestly of great importance, chiefly by reason of the principles which underlie them. The revival of conciliar government which is entailed is, in itself, noteworthy and may reasonably be the ground of great hopes for the future. The Deposited Book is itself the firstfruits of the new spirit, and the reception which, despite all criticism, that Book has had must, one confidently believes, have convinced the most hesitant of the bishops of the practical value of collective action by the episcopate, and, more important still, that the fruits of such action commend themselves, and deserve to commend themselves by their merits, to the mind and conscience of the Church in a way which the pronouncements of individual bishops seldom in the past have done. It cannot be gainsaid that if the provincial episcopates had been ready and willing to regulate thirty years ago those practices which they now approve, but then ineffectively sought to prohibit, the alleged excesses which cause anxiety in some quarters would long since have ceased.

I have spoken already of the power given by the Measure to authorize provincially additional forms of service, and need not restate the facts. It cannot be supposed that any Catholic can be offended by the substitution of the provincial episcopate for the Crown in Council. But the power given to the provincial episcopates by section 4 of the Measure to make "such rules as are required or authorized to be made by them under any rubric of the Deposited Book" deserves some consideration. As such rules when made are to "have effect . . . as if con-

tained in rubrics of the Deposited Book," the conferring of this power deserves careful scrutiny. But it is a mistake to suppose that any general authority is hereby given to regulate the manner in which public worship is to be celebrated. The Book itself does not "require or authorize" such rules. Indeed, I am not satisfied that it "requires or authorizes" any such rules at all save in respect of reservation, and I think the operation of the section is confined to validating those rules.

It is, however, profoundly unfortunate that the principles we have been considering—namely, regulation rather than prohibition, and corporate rather than individual regulation—are not consistently followed in the rubrics relating to reservation. In two respects those rubrics notably depart from such principles. The absolute prohibition of communion with the reserved sacrament save for the sick is one such instance. It is possible that the "sick" include persons suddenly required to undergo a dangerous operation and persons injured in an accident, though it would be easy to mention modern Acts of Parliament where "sickness" and "accident" are mutually exclusive terms. But soldiers proceeding upon active service and rescuers descending a burning mine are manifestly excluded, with all others suddenly called upon to face perils of any kind. Any such desiring communion with the reserved sacrament must by law be refused. I do not think it probable that in fact he would be refused; the priest concerned would say that in such case he was called upon to obey God rather than man; nor do I think it conceivable that any bishop would venture to take disciplinary action in such circumstances. But why the bishops should have created such difficulties for themselves and such problems of obedience and duty for the clergy passes the wit of man to imagine. On the other hand, the practice of communicating the "non-sick" apart from the Eucharist is notably capable of abuse and stands in urgent need of regulation, and the bishops by committing themselves to prohibition have lost the power of regulation.

If it be right that the grant of a licence to reserve should depend upon defined principles, and that the regulations regarding reservation should be as wide as the province and fixed by the provincial episcopate, it cannot also be right that the administration of those principles and rules by a particular bishop should be wholly irreviewable. True it is that the licence is discretionary and a discretionary power if exercised upon proper materials can seldom be successfully attacked. So it is in the case of faculties, where so long as the matter is one of discretion, the decision of the chancellor can seldom be upset on appeal. But no one with knowledge could affirm

that the right of appeal is therefore valueless. It does sometimes happen that discretion is exercised upon wrong principles, and, in any event, the mere existence of a right of appeal operates at all times silently, but none the less effectually, to check excessive individualism. These considerations equally apply in the case of reservation. The clergy are required in the name of obedience and order to surrender much which they as individuals believe to be valuable. They cannot fairly be so asked, and they are not likely to be willing so to act, unless they are assured that the new law will be fairly and consistently administered in all dioceses. Only some right of appeal or review, however informal, can assure this. There is ground for believing that the bishops themselves see the force of this argument, and are not unwilling to give effect to it. But it is unfortunate that this question was only raised after the Measure had attained its final form. I should be prepared to agree that a rubric is not the proper vehicle for conferring a right of appeal. But it is even more objectionable that a right of appeal should depend upon a mere rule, though the method of its exercise may properly do so. No solution whereby the right of appeal is given only by a rule which can at any time be rescinded will be finally satisfactory, since this is contrary to all legal principle.

IV

Supposing the Book to be finally enacted with full canonical authority, how must it then be regarded? Clearly no one, whether he has supported or opposed it, can be prevented from using all legitimate means to effect its further alteration. This point would have seemed too clear for argument were it not that in some quarters it has been suggested that Anglo-Catholics shall be required to give some kind of undertaking to regard it as "final." Such an undertaking is out of the question. No one has a right to ask it; no one on behalf of Anglo-Catholics has power to give it. If those distinguished Anglo-Catholics who have written to the newspapers to affirm that they cannot "accept" the Book mean no more than this, they claim only what cannot be denied. If, however, they mean more than this: if they imply that a prior disclaimer can discharge their consciences from any duty of obedience to the directions of a book which, *ex hypothesi*, has full canonical authority, then they owe it to their brethren and to the Church at large to explain the dogmatic basis of their position. If such legislation as I have supposed does not bind them, then what would? Is the Church of England incapable of legislating so as to bind a priest who does not concur? Would they admit this in favour of their opponents?

Finally, how and when is the Book to be enforced? It must be conceded that to authorize any book without intending that it shall be obeyed would be fatuous. But I would plead for such patience as would restrain coercive proceedings to the utmost allowable extent. It will be fairly generally recognized that until the courts are reformed such proceedings would be morally useless. Thereafter the possibility of such proceedings must be faced; no one can really wish the present anarchy to be permanent. But in urging great patience I should wish to found myself upon two considerations. Firstly, we are coming to recognize that there may be a real alternative to prosecution. Prelacy we may hope is dead, and the exercise of the powers of the episcopate in consultation with provincial bishops on the one hand, and with diocesan synods on the other, affords a real hope that methods of peace are capable of creating a measure of agreement which methods of coercion never can produce. Let the former be really tried before the latter are resorted to. The cause of Christ will not ultimately suffer in the process. Secondly, individualism dies hard. The faults which produced it have not all been on one side. The episcopate, collectively and historically considered, is not blameless in this matter. If peace and order are really to be ensued, it was never more important that the bishops should "use the authority given them, not to destruction, but to salvation; not to hurt, but to help."

ALAN LESLIE.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

AMONG contributors to the present issue, the Rev. K. D. Mackenzie is the author of a remarkable study entitled *The Confusion of the Churches: A Survey of the Problem of Reunion*, which was discussed by the Bishop of Winchester in the *Church Quarterly Review* for April, 1926. Mr. T. S. Eliot is the Editor of *The Monthly Criterion*, to which we drew attention in these notes last month. Mr. Alan Leslie is Chancellor of the Diocese of Lichfield.

We are asked to state that the General List of Retreats for 1927 with supplement is now ready, and can be obtained from the Secretary, A.P.R., 241, Abbey House, Victoria Street, S.W.1. Price 6d., by post 7d.

We much regret having misled our readers last month with regard to Keble's "Dedication," which was published soon after his death, and has appeared in more than one edition of his works since then. By the kindness of Professor Walter Lock, however, we are able to retrieve the error: for the poem printed below has, he believes, never before been published. We had it inserted as a loose leaf in the copies of the June number of *THEOLOGY*, which were on sale at Hursley, at the centenary celebrations on June 21, and it is here reprinted in permanent form. Dr. Lock adds a note describing it as "copied from an original in J. K.'s own handwriting—belonging to Mrs. J. R. Keble of Scarborough. It was lent to me by the Rev. G. C. Keble of Lockinge in June, 1918."

THE LARK'S COMPLAINT—DECEMBER, 1827

"Is that thy note, my bonny bird,
That oft in summertide was heard
In middle air to float?
Hast thou forgot each blither lay
And thought to cheer the autumn day
With one wild plaintive note?"

"When every summer joy is fled,
And flowers along their wither'd bed
Sink down to weep and die:—
When all around is cold and bare,
When trembles e'en the mountain hare
In her ferny form to lie:—

"When humming flies are dead and gone,
And the lizard left his sunny stone:—
When in his torpid cave
The adder shuns the chilling air,
Or sleeps secure in his unknown lair
Beneath the circling wave:—

THEOLOGY

"When earth is dull, and in the sky
 No song nor love for sympathy,
 Oh ! how can I be glad?
 My plaintive spirit would be fain
 To sing for thee some blither strain,
 But autumn makes me sad."

Poor bird, if pity might avail,
 To give thee mine I could not fail,
 For I can feel for thee !
 For (tho' 'tis folly to repine)
 My heart is now as sad as thine;
 Once it was full of glee !

Like thee I mourn my summer past
 And weep that autumn's withering blast
 Has strewed my heart with care !
 Ah ! once it felt a kindlier power :
 Hope, Joy, and Love, life's sweetest flower,
 Once gaily blossomed there !

But joys are left to cheer us still—
 Hark to the redbreast's buoyant trill
 Though the full choir be mute;
 Anon his scale the throstle tries.
 The blackbird too his part supplies
 The concert low to suit:—

Or trust thine eyes: by hill or dale,
 Unheeding storm or sweeping gale,
 The yellow gorse-flower blows,
 The purple heather still is gay
 And many a flower will greet the day
 E'en 'mid December snows.

Look up, my bonny bird, and view
 Those opening spots of heavenly blue;
 Or mark yon glory cloud,
 Clad like the sun in armour bright,
 And rushing on with warrior's might
 And giant speed endowed.

Then mark the healthful shower descend
 From where the rainbow colours blend
 Those dyes of heavenly birth !
 'Twere meeter far to banish pain,
 Since blessings reach, an angel train,
 From heaven unto earth.

Alike we feel the storms of life,
 Alike with ills our days are rife,
 But plenteous is the store
 Of mercy to the thankful given—
 Then mount up, earth-worn spirit, to Heav'n,
 There rest, and sing, and soar.

VARIATIONS IN THE HEADING TO THE PRAYER FOR THE CHURCH MILITANT

THE present interest in the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer has directed particular attention, among others, to the alterations in the wording of the heading to the "Prayer for the Church Militant" and of the first rubric at the close of the Communion Office. All the versions from 1549 to 1662 are accessible in original or facsimile form, except the so-called *Durham Book* in Bishop Cosin's Library and the *Sancroft Fair Copy* in the Bodleian Library. It may be useful at this juncture to give in full all the forms in which the heading and rubric have appeared, so that those who have not the various issues may have a full conspectus: The object here is not in any way to discuss doctrinal significance, but to give an accurate reproduction of the texts.

These are the precise forms:

HEADING.

RUBRIC.

1549 (May).

Let us praie for the whole state of
Christes church.

1552 (Aug.).

Let us pray for the whole estate of . . . the generall praier for the whole
Christes Church militant here in state of Christes church militant
earth. heare in yearth, . . .

1559.

Let us pray for the whole estate of . . . the generall praier, for the whole
Christes Church militant here in estate of Christes Church militant
earth. here in earth, . . .

1604.

Let us pray for the whole state of . . . generall prayer (for the whole
Christs Church militant here in earth. estate of Christs Church militant here
in earth) . . .

1637 (Laud's Scottish Prayer Book).

Let us pray for the whole state of . . . generall prayer, (for the whole
Christs church militant here in earth. estate of Christs Church militant here
in earth) . . .

The Revisers of 1661 used *three* copies of the Prayer Book for their alterations—viz.:

- (a) A copy of 1619, printed by Barker and Bill. This is known as the *Durham Book* and is in Bp. Cosin's Library at Durham (press mark, D. iii. 5). The alterations are in the hand of Cosin or of Sancroft, who acted as secretaries.

offer up our prayers & praises good e	. . . generall prayer (for the whole
Let us ^ pray for the ^ whole state of	Catholick
Catholick	estate of Christs ^ Church militant
Christs ^ Church militant here in earth.	here in earth

- (b) A copy of 1634, printed by Barker. This is known as *Sancroft's Fair Copy* and is in the Bodleian Library. Into it Sancroft copied out the amendments finally agreed upon.

Let us offer up our Prayers, & Praises
for the good Estate of Christ's Catholick Church. . . . generall prayer, (for the ^{good} whole Catholick
~~Let us pray for the whole state of~~ estate of Christ's Church militant
~~Christ's Church militant here in earth~~ ~~here in earth~~

- (c) A copy of 1636, printed by Barker. This is known as the *Convocation Book*. Into it Sancroft entered the final results of the revision completed 18 Dec., 1661. A facsimile was made by the Ordnance Survey Office and published in 1871 by Longman and Co., and others.

whole
good . . . generall prayer, (for the ^{good} whole
Let us pray for the whole state of ye Catholick of Christ.
Christ's Church militant here in earth. state of Christ's Church militant
~~the Catholick Church of Christ~~ ~~here in earth~~
~~Christ's Church militant here in earth~~

[The 1st and 4th lines are the original printed text; the 2nd and 3rd lines are the MS. alterations. In the margin, in another handwriting, are these words—"The Title stand just as it was before"—and these words are struck out by an ink line.]

The whole corrected text was finally copied out in professional fair-hands, and this MS. book was subscribed on 20 Dec. and sent to the King. It was reproduced in facsimile by Eyre and Spottiswoode, and C. J. Clay and Sons in 1891.

whole whole
Let us pray for the ^{whole} good state of . . . generall Prayer [for the ^{whole} good
Christ's Christ's militant here in earth.
~~the Catholick Church of Christ~~ state of ~~the Catholick Church~~ of
~~Christ~~]

[and, in a different hand, were added the words] militant here in earth.

Many remarkable variations are noticeable in the form of the word "state," in the use of capital or small letters in "Church," and in the comma after "prayer" in the rubric. It shows the urgent need of having a most scrupulous examination of the proposed Prayer Book before it is finally printed from the typographical as well as the literary point of view. How many, clergy or laity, have noticed the strange variants of "thine" and "thy" in the Collects for Easter Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday?

E. V. STOCKS,
University and Bishop Cosin's Librarian,
Durham.

May 12, 1927.

REVIEW

THE MANDAEANS

GINZA: DAS GROSSE BUCH DER MANDÄER. Translated and edited by M. Lidzbarski. Göttingen. 1925. M.47.

MANDAEAN STUDIES. By S. A. Pallis. Oxford University Press. 1926. 10s. 6d.*

In Southern Mesopotamia, up to about 1880 at least, some pathetic fragments of a Gnostic sect survived, Mandaeans by name. (*Mandā d'hayyē* means "knowledge of life"; Manda was called into existence by "the Great Mānā of Glory," and is an intermediary between the Supreme One and the world—in some places he is identified with Jesus Christ.)

This sect has suddenly come into the foreground of New Testament research. Their literature is at last available to the ordinary scholar. It is written in a Semitic language akin to Aramaic, with a peculiar script; a grammar of the language by Nöldeke has been published. The three books have all been edited and translated into German by M. Lidzbarski. "The Book of John" was published in 1915; it is a record of supposed sayings and doings of the Baptist and his disciples. The *Qōlastā* or Liturgies followed in 1920. Now, in 1925, the vast *Ginza* or Treasure House, sometimes called the Mandaean Bible, has appeared. It is divided into two halves, the *right* and the *left*, dealing with the living and the dead. A convenient method of reference is GR and GL.

Lidzbarski's views deserve to be treated respectfully, if critically. They may be summarised very briefly thus. "Jordan-baptism" is the characteristic rite of Mandaeism, that is, a weekly ceremonial washing in running water, which is always called "Jordan." The first example we have of a special sanctity attached to Jordan is 1 Kings v, where Naaman is bidden wash therein. In Mark i. the water has power to wash away sins. The three primitive heroes of the Mandaeans are Adam, Eve and Abel; Cain being unknown. Presumably the Jewish legends were shared with surrounding nations, and

* Other works on which this review is based are the art. "Mandaeans" by W. Brandt in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*; art. by R. Bultmann, "Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums," and by E. Peterson, "Bemerkungen zur Mandäischen Literatur," in the *Z.N.T.W.*, 1925, pp. 100 ff, and 1926, 236 ff., respectively.

a portion only of a considerable mythology has survived in the Old Testament. The beginnings of Mandaeism are surely pre-Christian. Persecutions at the hands of the Jews, referred to in the Ginza, could hardly have arisen in Babylonia. Rather the Mandaeans originated at a time when the Jews were in power and persecuted heterodox movements. The name Jordan shows that the Mandaeans began in the neighbourhood of that river and emigrated to Babylonia, perhaps because of the abundant supply of water in that land. They were violently opposed to the Babylonian star-worship; also to *Ruhā*, i.e., the (Holy) Spirit, who (feminine in Semitic languages) in these writings reminds us of *Dea Syra*. The connection with Christianity must be early, going back to its very beginning. The fact that the Mandaeans call themselves Nazoraeans is significant. The writings as they now exist arose for the most part in pre-Islamic times, but were codified under pressure of Islam, that the sect might be recognized with favour as "people of a book."

Certain German scholars have lost no time in using these results. Bauer in the new edition of his commentary on St. John in Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum N.T.* has introduced a great many illustrative passages from Mandaean documents. Professor Bultmann of Marburg has worked out the connection of St. John and Mandaeism in detail.* The Fourth Gospel up to now is an unsolved problem. It is not based on Hellenistic speculation nor on Palestinian Judaism as generally understood. It has affinities with the Hermetic literature, but the absence of polemic against the Old Testament and of any teaching about the demiurge or æons prevents our calling it Gnostic. It is now seen to be based on an Oriental mythology, the root idea of which is as follows. The soul, imprisoned on earth, is rescued by a heaven-sent Revealer. A parallel conception is that of the *Urmensch* (archetypal Man), imprisoned in matter, whose fate typifies that of the individual soul. Bultmann works out exhaustively the parallels. Here are a few.

Jn. xvii. 21: "That the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

Ginza R. ii. 64 (p. 58): "The Sent of the Light am I, whom the Great One has sent into this world."

Jn. xvii. 2: "Thou gavest him authority over all flesh."

Ginza R. iii. 73 (p. 70): "The Great One has . . . given thee authority over everything."

Jn. viii. 12: "I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in the darkness, but shall have the light of life."

Ginza R. v. 3 (p. 182): "Mandā d'hayyē revealed himself to all the children of men and saves them from darkness to light, from obscurity to the light of life."

* *Z.N.T.W.*, 1925, pp. 100 ff.

It is "extraordinarily probable" that the origin of Mandaeism is the religious sect which arose from the activity of John the Baptist, and is presupposed by the polemics of the Fourth Gospel. *Naṣwpaîos*, the name by which the Mandaeans described themselves, probably means "Observant," and was applied to Jesus because He belonged to such a circle of "Observanten," or keepers of a religious rule. There were two elements in primitive Palestinian Christianity, one represented by the Synoptic Gospels, the other (? akin to the Essenes) strongly influenced by the Oriental mythology of heterodox sects on the fringe of Judaism.*

Reitzenstein's theories are well known. The Heavenly Man myth was widely accepted in the countries round Palestine and had pressed into Judaism. He claims his chief support in the Mandaean literature. Jesus was recognised by his disciples as "the Man," and with this recognition came in the *mythos* which eventually took shape as the Creed.†

Now all this is enormously important if true. On the one hand the transcendental side of Christianity would be obviously part of the original faith, dating back to our Lord's ministry; on the other, the origin of the most precious part of our religion would be a heterodox fringe of Judaism, strongly influenced by Persian beliefs!

It is almost incredible that the theory should be argued so confidently when the earliest Mandaean MS. is dated 1560. But it will be well at this point to give a few extracts from the *Ginza*.

"He is the high King of light, the Lord of all Worlds of Light, the High One above all Uthras [angels] . . . the King of kings, the great Lord above all kings . . . He is the light, in whom is no darkness." G.R. i. 9, 10.

"The sun goes not down before him, the lights of his city are never extinguished." G.R. i. 25.

"They hunger and thirst not, and heat and cold . . . are not with them." G.R. i. 50.

"Love not gold and silver and the possessions of this world. For this world passeth away." G.R. ii. 30.

"They [the Christians] left their houses and became monks and nuns." G.R. ii. 50.

"Give alms to the poor and be a guide to the blind. When you give alms, mine elect, testify it not. . . . If you give with your right hand, tell it not to your left. If you give with your left hand, tell it not to your right." G.R. i. 104.

These instances are enough to show that the references to Christianity are late and the parallels are reminiscences of

* It is interesting to note yet another attempt, from an unexpected quarter, to plant the Fourth Gospel on Palestinian soil.

† See THEOLOGY, Feb., 1922, pp. 108 ff.

New Testament passages. Before we proceed further two more extracts will serve to show the character of the Ginza.

"After the Arabian Mahammad, the son of Bizbat, will no prophet again come into the world." G.R. ii. 164.

From the left part, the Book of the Dead, G.L. p. 549.

"In at the door of the prisoners did I pass,
 My splendour arose over their prison.
 Over their prison arose my splendour,
 And through my fragrancy they became sweet smelling.
 Through my fragrancy they became sweet smelling,
 And Sheol was enlightened by my splendour.
 The souls perceived it,
 There they are weeping and wailing and shedding tears.
 I call to the keeper of the prisoners,
 'Open the door for the Souls.'
 To which he said,
 'How many should I let out of a thousand,
 How many should I let out of ten thousand?'

* * * * *

"The souls were separated
 From the place of darkness to the place of light.
 And Life is victorious."

This is a beautiful description of the Harrowing of Hell, and there is much in the same vein. But the Ginza as a whole is an almost inconceivable medley of good and bad—the aspirations of pious souls mingled with bitter charges against rival religions, faded myths, Gnostic absurdities, and the like. It shows a completely unhistorical mind, when a few passages are selected as important evidence for the origin of Christianity and the mass of the documents is freely acknowledged to be late. The error is akin to that of Jewish scholars who declare that the Sermon on the Mount is all to be found in the Talmud, without candidly adding: "And how much else besides!"

Clearly pioneer investigators are intoxicated with the new wine of their discoveries and more sober scholars must be called in to correct their exaggerations. E. Peterson has answered many of Lidzbarski's points.* That the Mandaeans term all flowing water Jordan does not prove their Palestinian origin; in Syriac hymns and the Jacobite baptismal rite all water in which one is baptized is called Jordan. The position of Abel in Mandaeism is said to spring from similar tales in nations which were neighbours to the Jews; but there is no evidence of such tales, and the Mandaean Abel may well be caused by *gnosis*, embroidering reminiscences of the Biblical story. The expectation that Jerusalem will be destroyed is said to point to

* See Z.N.T.W., 1926, 236 ff.

a date before A.D. 70; but Jerusalem may be used, as in Gnostic sources, to mean the bad æon.

Useful as Peterson's article is, we must turn to the book of S. A. Pallis, a Danish scholar, for the antidote to these wild theories. *Mandaean Studies* has happily been translated into English and published by the Oxford University Press. It is difficult reading, but forms an indispensable companion to Lidzbarski and Reitzenstein. Mandaeism is treated as a department of Babylonian religion; its relations to Persia, Judaism and Gnosticism are carefully discussed, but this very learned scholar only incidentally finds it necessary to discuss Christianity. He concludes his opening arguments by saying that "all the central ideas of the Mand-religion: the cosmology, world-process, the baptism, the doctrines of the soul's journey after death and of the inhabitation of the planets by demons—all these things pointed towards an influence from the Persian religion or from Gnosticism; on the other hand no single point showed affinity with Judaism." The later strata, especially, of the documents show an infiltration of Christian influence. There is nothing to prove a movement in the reverse direction (p. 114). Jewish elements, he now proves, have come in through Islamic Arabic literature. Finally a comparison with Gnosticism shows that "in its very essence, the outlook on life and the cult, the Mandaean religion was typically Gnostic, and also, that we were right when speaking above of a Gnostic stratum in Mandaeism. Indeed . . . as regards the cult Mandaeism is the best known Gnostic system, for our knowledge of other Gnostic sects is limited to their speculative myths."

This common-sense conclusion will be generally welcomed as settling the matter for the present. Theoretically it remains possible that certain elements incorporated in the Mandaean literature are pre-Christian and therefore must be reckoned with in a study of Christian origins. But the improbability is such that for practical purposes we can ignore it, and we certainly need not waste our time in filling our note-books with Mandaean parallels to the Fourth Gospel.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

NOTICES

THE PHILOSOPHY OF FRANCIS BACON. By C. D. Broad. Cambridge University Press. 2s. 6d.

Dr. Broad's Address at Cambridge on occasion of the Bacon Tercentenary is a lucid and humorous exposition of Bacon's Inductive "Philosophy," succeeded by an effective little critique.

Bacon is radical about the philosophy of the past. He finds it static and barren: he apparently does not doubt that philosophy ought to have practical results, though he condemns a narrow pragmatism. What is needed is a combination of rationalism and empiricism, and this he sets out to provide, and all on the assumption that philosophy should be a weapon of the discoverer.

He was, says Dr. Broad, evidently a "Christian of that sensible school which regards the Church of England as a branch of the Civil Service"—which confirms our impression that common sense so abysmal as Bacon's is yet too shallow for some profundities.

Like some scientists, Bacon envisaged Nature as a kind of pyramid, at the apex of which is the *Summary Law of Nature*—he seems, in fact, to have been led away by the *ignis fatuus* of a "scientific" monism which "explains" by means of eliminating difference.

To conclude this criticism (of Bacon rather than of Dr. Broad's admirable pamphlet) it may be pointed out that, like most rebels, Bacon is deeply indebted to tradition: even a superficial view is struck by his use of the distinction between natural and supernatural sources of knowledge, of the Four Causes, and of the idea of ultimate principles and brute facts: while, on the other hand, he is still far removed from a criticism of the fundamental categories of our thought.

B. E. BUTLER.

THE THEOLOGY OF SAINT PAUL. By Fernand Prat, S.J. Translated from the eleventh French edition by John L. Stoddard. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 15s.

THE LIFE OF ST. PAUL. By F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D. Jonathan Cape. 10s. 6d.

Fr. Prat's great book on the theology of St. Paul is from one point of view a model of how such things should be done. Given the initial assumption that the orthodox system of Catholic doctrine is a true development of a doctrinal system already implicit in the Bible, then it is necessary to suppose that the correct interpretation of any document in the New Testament is that which was placed on it by the later theologians who used it to justify the dogmatic system which they evolved. The only difficulty about such a method of procedure is that it gives us a conception of the Pauline writings as a set of dogmatic treatises intended to expound a system of theology.

Of course they are nothing of the kind. They are letters intended to correct current errors; they are written in a desperate attempt to enforce the one thing that to St. Paul seemed really vital, the absolute centrality of Christ in the Christian religion, against forms of doctrine or

moral aberrations which threatened to make the faith of his converts something different from the faith in Jesus Christ.

Consequently any book which follows the traditional method of Catholic or Protestant expositors in attempting to prove that any given system of theology can be drawn from the Pauline writings is entirely misleading. It is bound to read into them ideas which had never entered the mind of the writer. For example, Père Prat rightly recognizes that "justification" means "to be made righteous." But since St. Paul has to be reconciled with St. James and with the facts of later Christian experience as rationalized by orthodox theology, "The justice of which St. Paul speaks is *first* justice—that is, the passage from a state of sin to a state of holiness . . . the justice of St. James is *second* justice, otherwise called the increase of justice, the regular development of the Christian life." Of course if St. Paul had ever admitted such a distinction his one argument against the Judaizers would have vanished; for they would have admitted that faith conferred first justice, but declared that the Law was needed to develop the second.

The historical sections as a whole are good; but it is a little peculiar to find an orthodox writer holding that the meeting of St. Paul with the Apostles in Gal. ii. is the same as the Council of Jerusalem—a view which means that the narrative of Acts is worthless at this point—and that St. Paul really claims that his teaching on the Eucharist was based on direct revelation. And in these days it is more than startling to read that "Since the conversion of St. Paul is, next to the resurrection of the Saviour, the miracle which is best attested, the least capable of any natural explanation and consequently the most annoying to freethinkers, we cannot be surprised that rationalistic criticism has made desperate efforts to weaken its convincing force." After all, the psychological explanation of St. Paul's conversion is the sort of subject which is normally set as a first essay for the student of the psychology of religion.

But the young seminarist who wants a complete account of the orthodox exposition of the Pauline writings, which will give him an answer to every question and leave no room for supposing that a single difficulty exists, cannot do better than study Père Prat.

Dr. Foakes-Jackson has accomplished a really difficult task. He has produced a Life of St. Paul which is easy to read and understand, and yet does justice to the career and teaching of the Apostle. Occasionally he is hypercritical as to supposed historical difficulties; for instance, he cannot understand why St. Paul should have been concerned in the death of St. Stephen, since the Pharisees as a whole were not unfavourable to the Church. He explains his action as an isolated outburst organized by the Hellenistic synagogues, and is then compelled to assume that the accounts of a wide persecution in Jerusalem and St. Paul's later account of it in Acts xxvi. 10 are exaggerations due to the author of Acts. But this difficulty vanishes when we realize that St. Stephen was the pioneer of a conception of Christianity which was bound to unite the Pharisees and Sadducees against him. When his followers had been dispersed and the Hebrew Christians went on as before, there was no reason for continued hostility. But these are minor defects. It is perhaps a more serious shortcoming that he does not deal with the pressing question of modern Pauline criticism, namely, the extent to which such conceptions as the Holy Spirit, grace, salvation, and redemption were borrowed, either directly or through the medium of Hellenistic Judaism, from the theological specula-

tions of contemporary pagan thought, and again, how far such conceptions had already made their way into the mystery-religions. He rightly holds that St. Paul's sacramental teaching has little or nothing to do with the mystery-cults; but it is an open question whether his theological thought is not deeply indebted to an atmosphere of theological speculation of a largely pagan origin. On the other hand, Dr. Foakes-Jackson could rightly claim that at the present moment the whole question is too complicated and obscure to be discussed in a book intended for the general reader.

There is certainly no book which we can more confidently recommend to the non-specialist, whether lay or clerical, who wishes to form an accurate judgment as to the history of the life of the Apostle of the Gentiles and to understand the working of his thought. To read the Acts and the Pauline Epistles with this book as a running commentary is to gain a really valuable insight into the early development of Christianity; although it must be repeated that Dr. Foakes-Jackson's doubts as to the historicity of some parts of Acts are not in most cases really well-founded.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

PURPOSIVE EVOLUTION. The Link between Science and Religion. By Edmund Noble. Allen and Unwin. 18s.

In spite of the subject with which this work sets out to deal, the characteristic of purposiveness seems to be singularly absent from it. Only the faintest thread of constructive argument flows vaguely through its 578 pages. The writer appears to consider that a purified theology will afford great assistance in the "reconciliation" of science and religion, but it is almost impossible to separate the manner in which this is expected to come about from the mass of indefinite statements with which the book is encumbered. Dr. Noble's main position seems to be Humian in that he accepts cosmic teleology divested of as much anthropomorphism as possible, but it remains far from clear why this should lead to any closer contact between the scientific and the religious minds, for the upshot of the discussion is that the "cosmic trend would then neither be ignored nor humanized." Dr. Noble appears to be under the impression that purposiveness has some close relation to scientific thought; he therefore presumably regards science as not essentially quantitative, and this may explain a great part of the confusion which exists in his book. Page 518 and the immediately following pages contain perhaps the clearest statement of his views; they have some affinities to the organicism of Whitehead and the static teleology of Lawrence J. Henderson, but they are largely vitiated by a failure to realize fully that the languages of science and of religion cannot be mixed, and that the departmental terminologies of different ways of experience only form an unintelligible jargon when they are used indifferently one for the other. Scientific hypotheses, artistic judgments, metaphysical opinions, religious statements, all, in this book, pass about like counters of different colours but of absolutely identical value.

Moreover, the book is far too long. Dr. Noble is never content with one example to illustrate his point; he must needs introduce half-a-dozen, or even as many as eleven, as in the horrible example on page 395. The first two or three hundred pages are a mass of miscellaneous information; there are, for instance, bits of anthropology, and bits of literary criticism, bits of philology, biology, and Egyptology. In a learned work where the

footnotes cover half of each page, this is legitimate, but where, as here, references are few and far between, it would go ill with anyone who wished to refer back to a quoted authority, and the impression gained by a reader sensitive to such matters is far from pleasant. As for the exact contribution of this work to contemporary thought, posterity must be left to decide, always supposing that some commentator succeeds in disentangling what is valuable from among the encompassing cloud of platitudes. Had the book been compressed by at least 50 per cent., its value might have been apparent to this generation.

JOSEPH NEEDHAM.

CHRIST THE KING. A Study of the Incarnation. By K. D. Mackenzie, M.A. S.P.C.K.: The Churchman's Popular Library. 1s. 6d.

We welcome a fresh addition to this wonderfully cheap series. It will fully maintain the high standard of excellence set by the earlier volumes. Mr. Mackenzie supplies in popular language the information that many men and women in all walks of life want, and do not know where to find. Nothing could be better, for example, than his short chapter on "Gospel Truth." Again, in his final chapters, he compresses into a short space much really valuable thinking. There are a few small points where he intrudes somewhat needless theological speculations and refinements. We wish that he had omitted the note at the bottom of page 75. No doubt subtle theological grounds can be found for the assertion that the sacrifice of the Cross was offered by our Lord's manhood to His Divinity, but the whole idea, as thus stated, sounds far too much like the division of His activities which on page 77 is rightly condemned as "intolerably artificial" to the modern mind. Again, on page 91 he makes incidental statements about Christ's risen body which are highly disputable. Its visibility and tangibility and occupation of space may well have been, as Bishop Horsley or Bishop Westcott supposed, temporary condescensions. On page 10 the reference to St. Luke xviii. 32 seems to be a misprint. But these are at best small blemishes in a good and careful piece of work. We hope that the volume will have the wide circulation that it deserves.

E. J. BICKNELL.

ARCHBISHOP LAUD. By A. S. Duncan-Jones. Macmillan. 6s.

Archbishop Laud has seldom met with justice, probably because he cannot be classed with either the outstanding heroes of history or with those single-idea characters so easy to draw and so typical of the seventeenth century.

Laud was a little man, brimming over with fire and resolution, and he is at last adequately limned in this appropriately small and vivid volume, written (as all small books should be) by an accomplished master, not only of his subject, but of all upon which it impinges. For to understand Laud one must understand the curious era in which he lived, and to this end Mr. Duncan-Jones's method is admirably adapted. He places before us a succession of pictures, deftly outlined, through which his central figure moves rapidly and characteristically, undeviating from the principles to which he dedicated his allegiance. They may seem to a modern reader to be indeed modern, but to Laud himself is due the rally to the con-

ception of unity within a One and Universal "Catholic Church of Christ, neither Rome nor a conventicle." The author claims Laud as a worthy successor of Parker and Bancroft.

His "liberal movement" had to struggle against the two extremes, and in this connection nothing could well be more lucid than the exposition of the gist of the Calvinian doctrine (pp. 20-26), and of the position of Cardinal Bellarmine, who is selected as the most telling of the Roman protagonists.

Equally helpful are the briefer explanations of the High Commission, of episcopacy in Scotland, of the real financial problem, and the lively pictures of "the reign of culture" in art and music—but why are clothes omitted?—and of the actualities of parliamentary debate.

Mr. Duncan-Jones possesses a true gift of portraiture in words.

Particularly skilful are the portraits which emerge by successive touches not only of the Archbishop himself, but of the "tragic king" and "always unreliable" queen, of the malevolent Prynne, the subtle Williams, and the calculating Pym. There are some epigrammatic comparisons—the Commons who

"felt about Romanism much as many of their modern successors feel about Bolshevism. The thought of it deprived them of the use of their reason . . ."

and several almost thumb-nail sketches of secondary but representative figures such as Bastwick and Burton, Buckingham's tiresome mother, or Bramhall and Bedell of the "wide views and pastoral heart." But the whole volume is packed with good things. One would only beg for a trifling addition—that an explanation, say in the index, should tell the non-expert who Heylyn was, and that the year dates should be given more generously.

A. D. GREENWOOD.

LIFE AND TIMES OF BISHOP ULLATHORNE. By Dom Cuthbert Butler, O.S.B. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 2 vols., 25s.

The name of Ullathorne is known to few of those who are familiar with the names of Manning, Talbot, Newman, or Wiseman; but Dom Cuthbert Butler's book shows how, as more typical of English Roman Catholics, Ullathorne, who was intimately concerned with all these, was in some respects more interesting and more influential than any of them. The schemer at the heart of the Vatican, the princely ultramontane teetotaller, the profound theologian, who wrote English with consummate art, because his sincerity was so meticulous—none of these so well illustrate the important element in the religious life of England, which Roman Catholicism has now certainly become, as the bishop who was descended from Sir Thomas More and dropped his h's, who flogged contumacious nuns, secured for Newman his Cardinal's hat, and won repentance from convict murderers on their way to the gallows, who began life by running away to sea, and yet who was ever reading mystical theology, so that his deep knowledge of the Fathers enabled him to enter into controversy with Pusey. A strong, a hard character was Ullathorne, an uncompromising Englishman; and yet a Benedictine who ruled a diocese by spending most of his time in solitude and interior prayer. Few among English clergy of any denomination could write then, or

to-day, with more dignity, and his books on the spiritual life are still selling in considerable numbers.

Dom Cuthbert Butler has written with admirable openness and with an eye that never ceases to watch for living issues. It is difficult to recall a book which gives so clear an insight into the problems and the temper of Roman Catholicism in England; he is something of a partisan, inevitably, but he conceals nothing, and by giving the evidence he allows readers to be as judicial as himself. It was a fascinating period, and it weighs hard upon the present. The biography is an absorbing book, and teaches much of necessary things.

What does it reveal? Among those whom the Papal Obedience united in England, giving them an enthusiastic personal adherence to all that is of faith, there was an unceasing contentiousness which went to extremes, and made not a few unscrupulous. Of these Manning was the chief. They were constantly rebelling, and referring things to Rome. Rome got very tired of them, was puzzled by their quarrelsome queerness, and tried to shelve their questions. But neither time nor toil could still their enmities, nor weary their taste for intrigue. Sometimes it was a personal question, sometimes a question of policy, never a devotional one. In English-speaking countries Roman Catholicism seems to harden a sectarian temper, not familiar in it elsewhere. Was principle involved? It is difficult to give a general answer. But one feels that it was a tussle between two points of view: on the one side Wiseman's, which was Rome's, that England should be treated generously and won back to Catholic unity by all the claims of culture, of reason, of religion; on the other, that they should guard so carefully against Protestant errors that everything of Roman orthodoxy should be hurled forward with offensive vigour so as to retain for their Catholicism no doubtful aroma. But mixing with this was jealousy of, and among, converts, and questions of Continental, as opposed to insular, taste. And these produced many complications. But deeper still and more important was another question—whether the function of Catholicism was to spread its savour more widely, or to concentrate rather on intensifying its savour. Was it to be the religion of all sorts and conditions of men, or was it to be a religion which could act with more decision by the development of its individual characteristics?

The question became acute in a reunion movement known as the Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom. This aimed at bringing back the Church of England as a whole to the Roman centre of unity, and it gained the approbation of Pius IX. But having done so, it proceeded to enunciate the Branch theory, which is obviously irreconcilable with a belief in the visible unity of the Church, or with a belief in the Papacy as the test and guarantee of Catholic unity. At this point, therefore, Roman Catholics were advised to separate from the Association. It was held scandalous even to appear to be identified with those who held principles which have been rejected by the Holy See. But the movement itself, a movement which in our own days has been continued with more tact and deeper understanding by the *Conférenciers de Malines*, is in no way inconsistent with Papal policy, or its authority, which is shown in this book as consistent, wise, and generous.

All these points are of intense importance to all those who are interested in Catholic unity; its issues are alive now, and show every prospect of becoming more urgent. This account of them is more important because

it does not attain the highest literary art; the documents appear, and are allowed to speak for themselves, on matters which, viewed either from the point of history or of present policy, exact the closest attention of all informed Churchmen, and on which the clergy must be the first to decide.

R. E. GORDON GEORGE.

BOOK NOTES

Lectures on the Holy Eucharist. Translated from the French of Monsignor Landriot, sometime Archbishop of Rheims. With Introduction by the Rev. P. N. Waggett, S.S.J.E. Faith Press. 3s. 6d. Dr. Waggett exactly sums up this book by calling it "eloquent and affectionate." Its importance is twofold. Firstly, it is of real devotional value, exhibiting throughout, as it does, a profound and attractive piety. Secondly, it is always of interest to read Roman Catholic writings which date from the seventh decade of the last century, when the Vatican Decree was imminent. For instance, *The Pope and the Council*, attributed to Döllinger, is a book too little read to-day. "Bishops like Landriot still hoped that no new dogma would open fresh gates of difficulty." The author reveals great learning, though much that he writes would naturally not stand the searching test of modern criticism. It is notoriously more difficult to translate French than German into readable English. There is a quaintness throughout this book, sometimes pleasing and sometimes less so. The following passage will illustrate what we mean: "Who will give me the wings of a dove, to raise me above the deserts of this world, to enjoy Thy vision, if not complete, at least calm and pure, as we enjoy the sun in winter on the top of a mountain, while the base is lost in damp fog?"

The Shadow on the Earth. By Owen Francis Dudley. Longmans. 4s. Paper covers, 2s. 6d. This is a tract on the problem of pain, written by a Roman Catholic writer. It frankly takes the form of a highly sensational novel; and in this lies its genius. Few will read a philosophical or theological treatise, and consequently thousands go on blaspheming against a cruel deity or life-force, without having seriously considered the problem of evil at all. We hope that this little book will be widely read; it deals in a convincing way with the much-discussed question of euthanasia, and brings translucently clearly before the reader's mind the fact that it is the dynamic of Christianity alone which can transform the sufferer and make his pain positively useful and creative.

Pain in the animal creation is barely touched upon. We are reluctant to criticize the book; but just two points must be mentioned. The first is obvious—namely, that we do not believe with the writer that the solution can only be found by submission to the see of Rome. The other is subtler, and, as we believe, by no means unimportant. Disease is regarded as "not strictly an evil at all," but as "a failure to attain perfect health." And the hero, when crippled, is treated simply as incurable. Yet Christ spoke of the woman with the spirit of infirmity as bound by Satan, and he never appears to have regarded any sufferer as incurable. Surely the Lambeth Conference Committee on the Ministry of Healing was right in saying that disease "in whatever way it may be overruled for good . . . is in itself an evil," and that it is "to be combated in God's Name,

and as a way of carrying out His Will." The living Christ is no less able and no less willing to heal the whole being to-day than He was in His incarnate life on earth. His work is being held up, as it was at Nazareth, because of our unbelief.

Ecclesiastical Training. By Cardinal Bourne. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 3s. 6d. A great part of Cardinal Bourne's life has been spent in training Ordination candidates or supervising such training. In this little book he has set down certain conclusions at which he has arrived. The strong desirability of segregating boys who appear to have vocations at an early age is persistently emphasized. "Of this mind of the Church there can be no doubt." There is much in the book which shows the Cardinal to be a penetrating student of human nature and a wise director of souls. Few would probably suggest that the seminary method of training should be adopted as the ideal or the norm in the Anglican Communion; and this would be specially true of junior seminaries. Deep psychological questions, however, are here involved with regard especially to the question of enforced celibacy. In certain minor respects the Cardinal appears to us to be rather unduly idealistic. The following quotation must suffice to illustrate this: "A boy can hardly be regarded seriously as an aspirant if he needs [corporal punishment]—his place is clearly elsewhere." The book has some useful appendices, the most important being the Decree of Cardinal Pole "ut in cathedralibus certus initiatorum numerus educetur, ex quo, tanquam ex seminario, eligi possint, qui digne ecclesiis præficientur"—the forerunner of the famous decree of the Council of Trent.

The Prophet Jonah: The Book and the Sign. By A. D. Martin. Longmans. 4s. 6d. Paper covers, 3s. "The purpose of these studies," the author writes, "is to offer to the general reader an interpretation of the Book of Jonah in harmony with the best scholarship of our time." An introductory note is contributed by Dr. Peake, in which he rightly points out that the Book of Jonah "ranks with the greatest things the Old Testament has contributed to the literature of religion."

We are, however, less impressed with Mr. Martin's study of the Book than is Dr. Peake, who has read it "with admiration and deep interest." We found its self-conscious erudition rather trying. It bristles on almost every page with literary allusions, and we are reminded of a candidate for the Honour School of Theology showing off in order to secure a first class. Despite all this, the essay is a serious, and in places penetrating, piece of work. The author concludes that the Book was written by a layman "as a satire upon the contemporary prophetic order, and . . . as an arraignment of the nation whom the prophets represented." He deals faithfully and entirely successfully with those who still defend the literal interpretation. Mr. Martin's translation, printed at the beginning, is of real value for an intelligent understanding of the Book.

FREDERIC HOOD.

S. Eustathius of Antioch. By A. E. Burn, D.D., Dean of Salisbury. The Inaugural Nicæan Lecture, 1926. Faith Press. 1s. The Society of the Faith is to be congratulated on the first of the lectures which they have founded to commemorate the celebration of the sixteenth centenary of the Council of Nicæa. Dr. Burn reproduces evidence little known in this country for the fact that just before the Council Eusebius of

Cæsarea had been excommunicated as a favourer of Arianism. He describes the acceptance of Eusebius' Creed (with the addition, of course, of *homousion*) as the triumph of the worldly and compromising policy of Constantine. The final section of the lecture, on the Teaching of Eustathius, is remarkable for the emphasis laid by the saint on the completeness of the Humanity of our Lord, an emphasis which goes very near indeed to the doctrine afterwards condemned as Nestorianism.

Sacramental Principles. An essay on the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist. By W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, D.D. Mowbray. 2s. 6d. A very important criticism of the "Modernist" view of the Eucharist as set forth by the present Bishop of Birmingham, and of the Liberal Evangelical view as exemplified by Canon Storr. Dr. Sparrow-Simpson begins by showing that the "symbolical" view of the meaning of our Lord's words at the Institution really destroys the treasured evangelical truth that we feed on Christ in the Sacrament. He then brings forward an imposing list of modern non-Catholic scholars who hold that St. Paul's doctrine was at least very similar to that of Catholics today. Finally, he lifts up the whole discussion to a very high level indeed by a most able exposition of the doctrine of Grace. This is a book which ought to be in the hands of any who are called on to deal with the problems of Eucharistic doctrine. The only thing which seems to be lacking is some discussion of the doubts which have recently been raised as to our Lord's intention of instituting a permanent sacramental rite.

Contemplative Prayer. By Père de la Taille, S.J. Translated by a Tertiary of the Order of Mount Carmel. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 1s. This little volume of twenty-nine tiny pages is light in the hand, but to the understanding a very burden of St. Christopher. The author warns us in the preface that he assumes considerable knowledge both of St. Thomas and of the writings of the mystics; but even so it seems unnecessarily difficult reading. Possibly it might have been better translated. The paper first describes the nature of contemplation as something akin to angelic knowledge, and goes on to deal with its peculiar trials and the kind of direction which it demands. Anglican readers will welcome the statement that in Purgatory "love itself is the fire which attacks and devours the impurities of the soul."

Prayer: Some Facts and Fallacies. By F. H. Brabant. S.C.M. 2s. An admirable manual; sensible, devout, practical, readable. No one could put it down without feeling that there is something in the practice of prayer, or without having learned a little of what that something is. The introduction, on four popular fallacies, is, for its purpose, as good as could be conceived. And the sketches of Frigidus and Callida, after the manner of William Law, are masterly, yet kindly, caricatures. We should have liked some more of these.

The Philosophy of Confucius. C. Y. Hsu. With an Introduction by J. Percy Bruce, M.A., D. Litt. Student Christian Movement. 1s. 6d. Well described by Dr. Bruce as "a real though modest contribution to our understanding of Chinese ancient thought as it impresses the Chinese modern student."

The Spiritual Armour, by St. Catherine of Bologna, together with *The Way of the Cross*, by Blessed Angela of Foligno. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 1s. A foreword provides a short biography of St. Catherine which gives a concrete interest to what might otherwise seem little more than a typical instance of the *sancta simplicitas* of the Middle Ages.

Blessed Angela's writing is more satisfying to modern taste. It deals with the familiar theme that "he that willet to love God perfectly must dispossess himself wholly of the love of every creature."

Light on Mount Carmel. By Ludovic de Besse, O.S.F.C. Edited in English by a Monk of Parkminster. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 2s. 6d. An admirable account of the four great mystical writings of St. John of the Cross. There could not be a better introduction to a spiritual master, and, as Father de Besse says, the "ordinary man" who will occupy himself in reading this kind of literature will at least have learnt "that there are regions of the spirit of which he had not so much as dreamt." Even to spend an hour on reading this little book will be very far indeed from a waste of time.

Two Essays on the Gospel Miracles and the Atonement. By the late David Dorrity, B.D. With a preface by Canon Peter Green. Commonwealth Press. These two essays appeared in the *Commonwealth* shortly before Canon Dorrity's lamented death, but his many friends will be glad to have them in permanent form.

Ignatian Retreats. Three retreats for lay people, according to the method and plan of the spiritual exercises. By W. H. Longridge, S.S.J.E. Mowbray. Fr. Longridge has laid all conductors of retreats under an obligation by giving them these most handy and practical sets of retreat notes, which illustrate exactly the kind of adaptation to present-day needs of which the Ignatian system is susceptible. Each retreat can be shortened, if desired, to the limit of two days, and the meditations to be omitted in this case are indicated. The book is printed in three forms: first in one volume, secondly in three volumes, and thirdly in loose sheets packed in envelopes, which can be used either by those making a private retreat, or by conductors who wish their exercitants to be provided with full notes for meditation.

K. D. M.

Christian Fellowship in Thought and Prayer. By Basil Matthews and Harry Bisscher (S.C.M. 2s.). A short account of the theory and practice of corporate thought and prayer, written by two distinguished Nonconformists. It describes the thought and discussion, in an atmosphere of prayer, which characterize many modern inter-denominational movements, and seems to claim an authority for the unanimous decisions of such groups, which is, to say the least, curious.

The Life of the World to Come. By Dom Anscar Vonier, O.S.B. (Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s.). Collected essays on eternal life by the Abbot of Buckfast, ending with a careful theological enquiry into the mystery of "The Resurrection of the Body."

Socialism and Democracy. By Father Cuthbert (Burns Oates and Washbourne. 3s. 6d.). Interesting essays on the modern Roman Catholic attitude on social problems in a democratic state, as defined by the encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII.

The Four Mysteries of the Faith. By the Rt. Rev. Monsignor Kolbe (Longmans. 6s.). An odd book by one who appears to be a convert to Roman Catholicism. The four Mysteries are the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Church, and Sacramental Presence. The Catholic teaching on these subjects is stated from the Roman point of view, in such a way as to meet many of the common objections which arise in non-Catholic minds. There

are some pages, however, which are obscure because the thought, or the statement of it, is confused.

The Sacrifice of the New Law. By the Rev. J. B. Brosnan (Burns Oates and Washbourne. 6s.). A criticism of the "novel" view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice represented in the Roman Church by Père de la Taille, S.J., and in the Anglican Church by Mr. Will Spens. Fr. Brosnan's view is that in the Eucharist the celebrant represents Christ both as Priest and Victim. He makes Christ really and truly present, and also, under a different mode of expression, makes present the whole (numerically one and the same) sacrifice of Calvary. A significant, but not an easy, book.

Love: The Religion of the Future. A Stepping Stone to Christian Unity. By Henry B. Young, M.A. (Wells Gardner, Darton and Co. 5s.). A simple—perhaps too simple—exposition of the Faith of the Gospel; a book which, quite unconsciously, makes it clear that there is very real need to ask the question: "What do you mean by love?"

The Catholic Student's "Aids" to the Study of the Bible. Vol. I., The Old Testament (General). By Hugh Pope, O.P. (Burns Oates and Washbourne. 7s. 6d.). This is the second edition of a book published thirteen years ago. It is most emphatically "official," for it not only has the *Nihil Obstat* of the Archdiocese of Westminster, but is introduced by Cardinal Bourne himself, who says that it gives "in accurate, compact, but not too concise terms, the lines on which the study of the Bible should be approached by a Catholic at the present day." It prints in full, with a translation, the encyclical of Leo XIII. on the study of the Bible, and the Replies of the Biblical Commission, and contains much valuable information on such subjects as the Canon and Versions of the Old Testament, the evolution of the Text of the Hebrew Bible, and short statements on the Bible in the British Isles, the Priesthood, and the Sacrifices, and similar points. It ignores the modern point of view altogether, believing that the inspiration of the Bible is incompatible with error of any kind.

God and the Absolute. T. G. Dunning, M.A., Ph.D. (S.C.M. 3s.). This is an important and interesting discussion of some of the questions which are fundamental for systematic thought about religion. It aims at developing a *via media* between those who would make religion and theology entirely subordinate to metaphysics, and those who insist that there must be a specifically Christian philosophy.

The Quiet Hour. William Adams Brown (Association Press, New York). Prayers written for, and used in, the Chapel of the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Few, if any, could be used in public worship in our communion, even in the most informal service.

Theology and the Modern Man. W. B. Selbie (S.C.M. 1s. 6d.). Simple chapters by the learned Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford. The book is fairly orthodox, but the theory of the Atonement expounded in the chapter on Salvation is a purely subjective one. A. E. B.

The Capacity for God (Confessio Credentis) R. F. Horton, M.A., D.D. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 7s. 6d.). This book is, as its second title implies, a personal statement of its author's belief, which takes the form of a treatise on Faith as the Master Faculty. It deals with the relation of Faith to the "two Bibles," Scripture and Nature; shows why the method of Faith is to be preferred to those of "Christian Science,"

Theosophy, and Spiritualism and expounds the author's attitude towards the new psychology, home and foreign missions, Catholic and sacramental Christianity, the problem of the good man without faith, and the science of comparative religion. The most interesting parts are the autobiographical chapters, especially "The Intimate Relationship," in which the author relates how his faith in Congregationalism was confirmed finally by Hatch's Bampton Lectures. It is rather startling, at any rate, to those reared in a different tradition, to find him assuming that "a strong believer" may regard the Incarnation as insignificant, and that a man may be a Christian without believing in the immortality of the soul. The last chapter, on the Creed, appears to assume that the composers of the Creed believed in a "three-storied Universe," a fallacy recently exposed in THEOLOGY; and the author closes with a form of creed which he could say "without reservations."

St. Augustine, De Fide et Symbolo. Edited by Harold Smith, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.). This is one of the series of Texts for Students, with brief introduction, and footnotes on each page. It appears to fulfil its purpose admirably.

The Spirit of Glory. By Canon F. W. Drake (Longmans. 4s. 6d.). This consists of eleven meditations with the general subject of the relation of God the Holy Spirit to different aspects of our devotional and practical life. This beautiful book, based on the system and tradition of the English Church at its best, is worthy of the most careful study. It is especially remarkable for the skilful use of the sayings of holy men and women of different ages and countries, which make it more interesting and easy to read than is at all common with books of this kind; we have not for a long time seen a modern devotional book which we like better.

Original Sin and Redemption. By the Rev. W. E. Wibly, B.D. This is a thoughtful study of the different theories which have been held on these two subjects. The author does not decide in favour of any one theory, but holds that almost all represent different aspects of the truth. His account of the "evolutionary" theory of sin does not mention the objection that "spiritual" sins, as distinct from sins of the flesh, cannot be survivals from our pre-human nature.

The Catholic Church and Philosophy, by Fr. Vincent McNabb, O.P. (Burns Oates and Washbourne. 4s.), with preface by Hilaire Belloc, is a very interesting short history of philosophy from the Roman Catholic point of view. More than half the book is devoted to the method and teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas: Bacon, Descartes, and Kant are regarded as the leaders of a movement away from truth and common sense to the hopeless confusion of modern thought. It is hardly fair to apply the famous proverb about the horse-hoofs of the Turk to his predecessors, the Arabs, who passed on the philosophy of Aristotle to the medieval Church (p. 33). The author lays emphasis, only too truly, on the rapid growth of ignorance in the modern world, and the loss of the ideal of liberal education.

The Quest of the Boy. By F. W. W. Griffin, M.A., M.D. (Faith Press. 1s. 6d.). This is a study of the psychology of the adolescent from the scoutmaster's point of view, with a bibliography at the end of each chapter. It is interestingly written, and at times somewhat bold in its suggestions.

The Spirit in Life and Thought. (Hodder and Stoughton, 5s.) This is the report of the papers read at the Southport Church Congress, 1926. It is not a book which can be adequately reviewed in a few lines, but

attention is drawn to the description of Mr. Hall's work for housing in Dublin (p. 203), and to Sir W. H. Hadow's paper on Church Music (p. 217).

C. B. M.

From Messrs Burns Oates and Washbourne we have Volumes V. and VI. of the collected *Spiritual Works of Abbot Blossius* (reviewed in our January number) and also in the Orchard Books No. 10, *The Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesu Christ*, by Nicolas Love.

From the same publishers comes Father M. C. D'Arcy's study of *The Mass and the Redemption*, in which he seeks to make clear the essential function of the Mass in the plan of the Redemption, and gives us a helpful insight into the theory of the Mass propounded by Père M. de la Taille, the author of *Mysterium Fidei*, of which this book is to some degree an English synopsis.

H. M. R.

GNOSTIC SCRIPTURES INTERPRETED

By G. A. GASKELL

The great, insistent, unsolved problem of modern Christian Philosophy relates to the disputed historicity of Jesus and to the ignored inspiration of the Scriptures. The opponent critics—Arthur Drews, J. M. Robertson, W. B. Smith, L. P. Couchoud, and Georg Brandes—argue that Jesus is mythical, and thereby suggest that metaphorical meanings underlie the Gospel story. This should agree with inspiration, but in the teaching of liberal Christianity, equally with that of opponent critics, inspiration has no value. All biblical critics, from Dr. Henson, Bishop of Durham, to the erudite John M. Robertson, are quite agreed to neglect the claims of Divine Inspiration to be a factor in the origin of the Scriptures. The writer of the above volume contends that this suppression of ancient doctrine is a vital mistake, for he holds that the only really valuable element in the Scriptures is the DIVINE INSPIRATION that originated them. This Divine factor is prominent in the philosophy of religion which is set forth in this book. In this philosophy the errors, defects, miracles, contradictions and absurdities which we find in the Scriptures, are simply evidence of the symbolism by which the Divine undermeanings are to be discovered. This arcane knowledge would dispose at once of the “difficulties” which beset biblical scholars who studiously ponder over the outer expression and are blind to its inner significance. **THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION WOULD RENEW ITS YOUTH** when no longer bound down to the materialism of this age. A material Jesus would give place to the concept of a power of God incarnate in human nature, as *The Epistles* teach. The writer draws attention to the “holy men” who wrote *The Gospels* under the Divine Influence which invented and contrived the sacred story in such specific terms that it became a symbolism of the undermeanings. The holy men were not responsible for what they wrote (2 *Pet.* i. 21), hence they never presumed to affix their names to inspired writings.

This book contains interpretations of the *Hymn of the Soul*; a large portion of *Pistis Sophia*; selections from several Gnostic writings; excerpts from *Mandaean*, *Manichaean*, and *Apocryphal* Scriptures; and from Babylonian and Grail legends. In the exegesis of these writings there are to be found, not the banalities of modern anthropology, but meanings of high spiritual value in religion, philosophy and science.

Uniform with the writer's *Egyptian Scriptures Interpreted* (7s. 6d.).

10s. 6d. Postage 6d.

LONDON: THE G. W. DANIEL COMPANY

Graham House, Tudor Street, E.C.4

S.P.C.K. Translations

Select list. The full list will be sent on application.

JEWISH TEXTS

THE TESTAMENT OF ABRAHAM. G. H. Box. With Testaments of Isaac and Jacob. S. GASELEE. 6s. net.

JEWISH DOCUMENTS OF THE TIME OF EZRA. (The Assuan Papyri.) A. E. Cowley. 4s. 6d. net.

THE WISDOM OF BEN-SIRA (ECCLESIASTICUS). W. O. E. OESTERLEY. 3s. 6d. net.

By R. H. CHARLES.

THE BOOK OF ENOCH. 3s. 6d. net.

THE BOOK OF JUBILEES. 5s. 6d. net.

THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS. 3s. 6d. net.

THE ASCENSION OF ISAIAH. Together with "The Apocalypse of Abraham" in one volume. 4s. 6d. net.

THE APOCALYPSE OF EZRA (II. ESDRAS). G. H. Box. 3s. 6d. net.

THE APOCALYPSE OF ABRAHAM. G. H. Box. With "The Ascension of Isaiah" in one volume. 4s. 6d. net.

THE BIBLICAL ANTIQUITIES OF PHILO. M. R. JAMES. 8s. 6d. net.

THE SIBYLLINE ORACLES. (Books III.-V.) H. N. BATE. 3s. 6d. net.

THE LETTER OF ARISTEAS. H. ST. JOHN THACKERAY. 3s. 6d. net.

THE THIRD AND FOURTH BOOKS OF MACCABEES. C. W. EMMET. 3s. 6d. net.

THE BOOK OF JOSEPH AND ASENATH. E. W. BROOKS. 3s. 6d. net.

SUKKAH, MISHNA AND TOSEFTA. A. W. GREENUP. 5s. net.

THE SAYINGS OF THE JEWISH FATHERS (PIRKE ABOTH). W. O. E. OESTERLEY. 5s. net.

TRACTATE BERAKOTH. (Benedictions.) A. LUKYN WILLIAMS. 6s. net.

TRACTATE SANHEDRIN: MISHNAH AND TOSEFTA. HERBERT DANBY. 6s. net.

TRACTATE SHABBATH: MISHNA. W. O. E. OESTERLEY. 6s. net.

KIMHI'S COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS. (Book I, Selections.) R. G. FINCH. 7s. 6d. net.

THE GREEK FATHERS

ST. BASIL: ASCETIC WORKS. W. K. L. CLARKE. 12s. 6d. net.

ST. DIONYSIUS OF ALEXANDRIA. C. L. FELTOE. 4s. net.

DIONYSIUS THE AREOPAGITE: THE DIVINE NAMES AND THE MYSTICAL THEOLOGY. C. E. ROLT. 7s. 6d. net.

DOCTRINE OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES, THE. C. BIGG and A. J. MACLEAN. 3s. 6d. net.

EUSEBIUS: THE PROOF OF THE GOSPEL. W. J. FERRAR. 2 Vols. 20s. net. (Not sold separately.)

HIPPOLYTUS: PHILOSOPHUMENA. F. LEGGE. 2 Vols. 20s. net. (Not sold separately.)

ST. IGNATIUS: EPISTLES. J. H. SRAWLEY. 4s. net.

ST. MACARIUS: FIFTY SPIRITUAL HOMILIES. A. J. MASON. 15s. net.

MACARIUS MAGNES. T. W. CRAFER. 7s. 6d. net.

PALLADIUS: THE LAUSIAC HISTORY. W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE. 5s. net.

PALLADIUS: THE LIFE OF CHRYSOSTOM. H. MOORE. 8s. 6d. net.

THE LIBRARY OF PHOTIUS. J. H. FREESE. Vol. I. 10s. net.

S.P.C.K., LONDON

S.P.C.K. Translations *(Continued)*

A complete list may be had on application.

LATIN FATHERS

- ST. AUGUSTINE ON THE SPIRIT AND THE LETTER. W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON. 5s. net.
- ST. BERNARD: CONCERNING GRACE AND FREEWILL. WATKIN W. WILLIAMS. 7s. 6d. net.
- MINUCIUS FELIX: THE OCTAVIUS. J. H. FREESE. 3s. 6d. net.
- NOVATIAN: ON THE TRINITY. H. MOORE. 6s. net.
- TERTULLIAN: ON PRAYER, ON BAPTISM. 3s. net.
- TERTULLIAN: AGAINST PRAXEAS. 5s. net.
- TERTULLIAN: CONCERNING THE RESURRECTION OF THE FLESH. A. SOUTER. 12s. 6d. net.

LITURGICAL TEXTS

- ST. AMBROSE: ON THE MYSTERIES AND ON THE SACRAMENTS. T. THOMPSON and J. H. SRAWLEY. 4s. 6d. net.
- THE PILGRIMAGE OF ETHERIA. M. L. MCCLURE and C. L. FELTOE. 6s.
- BISHOP SARAPION'S PRAYER-BOOK. J. WORDSWORTH. 2s. 6d. net.
- THE SWEDISH RITE. By E. E. YELVERTON. 8s. 6d. net.
- TWENTY-FIVE CONSECRATION PRAYERS. ARTHUR LINTON. 7s. 6d. net.
- SERVICE BOOK OF THE HOLY ORTHODOX CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC CHURCH. 20s. net.

ORIENTAL TEXTS

- THE ETHIOPIC DIDASCALIA. By J. M. HARDEN. 9s. net.
- ST. IRENAEUS: THE APOSTOLIC PREACHING. (Armenian.) J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON. 7s. 6d. net.

LIVES OF THE CELTIC SAINTS

- ST. BERNARD: ST. MALACHY OF ARMAGH. H. J. LAWLOR. 12s. net.
- THE LATIN AND IRISH LIVES OF CIARAN. R. A. STEWART MACALISTER. 10s. net.
- ST. DAVID. A. W. WADE EVANS. 7s. 6d. net.
- ST. PATRICK. NEWPORT J. D. WHITE. 6s. 6d. net.
- THE LIFE OF ST. SAMSON OF DOL. THOMAS TAYLOR. 5s. net.
- THE LIFE OF ST. GALL. MAUD JOYNT. 7s. 6d. net.

SELECT PASSAGES

- ANTE-NICENE EXEGESIS OF THE GOSPELS. HAROLD SMITH. Vols. I.-III. Each 7s. 6d. net.
- DOCUMENTS ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH. B. J. KIDD. Vol. I. To A.D. 313, 7s. 6d. net. Vol. II. A.D. 313-461, 10s. net.

- SELECT PASSAGES ILLUSTRATING MITHRAISM. A. S. GEDEN. 3s. 6d. net.
- SELECT PASSAGES ILLUSTRATING NEOPLATONISM. E. R. DODDS. 5s. net.
- PISTIS SOPHIA. GEORGE HORNER. Introduction by F. LEGGE. 16s. net.

S.P.C.K., LONDON

ENGLISH CHURCH UNION

THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION still maintains the unique position which it has occupied for seventy years in the Catholic Movement.

It devotes its enormous resources to the steadfast defence of Catholic Doctrine and Discipline, and persists in upholding the claim of the Church of England to be an integral part of the whole Catholic Church of Christ.

It has devoted itself, through its Literature Committee, to the production of literature in all branches of Theology and Ethics.

Early next year it will publish a One Volume Catholic Commentary on the whole Bible, which ought to be of invaluable service to the cause.

The Union, through its Legal Committee and by means of its great financial resources, is able to afford counsel, protection and assistance to all persons, lay or clerical, who may be assailed in any spiritual matter.

In all its activities the Union seeks to co-operate with all other Catholic Societies, and looks forward hopefully to the day when all such Societies may be united and work together under one leadership for the support of Catholic Principles and Practice.

Conditions of Membership : Membership is open to all members of the Church of England and of Churches in Communion with her who are communicants, and the membership is graduated as follows : Full Members, 10/- a year ; Associates, 2/6 ; and Adherents, 1/-.

The Church Union Gazette is published monthly at the incredibly low price of 1/6 per annum, post free.

ARNOLD PINCHARD,

Secretary.

31, Russell Square, W.C. 1.